

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1882.

The Week.

WHILE the party chiefs in Washington are looking up new victims from whom they may possibly wring a few dollars to pay their election expenses this fall, and raging against all persons who call in question the morality or legality of such proceedings, the courts are dealing some heavy blows at the practice of assessing office-holders in the only case now before them. A short time since Gen. N. M. Curtis was convicted by a jury under the law in such cases made and provided, and now the Court has refused to grant a new trial, which was applied for on the ground of unconstitutionality of the statute. This, though it will undoubtedly still further cool Mr. Jay A. Hubbell's ardent desire to be a party in a test case with the Civil-Service Reform Association, is probably offset for that worthy by Attorney-General Brewster's decision that Congressmen are not among the Government officers contemplated by the act. The language of the statute was evidently employed loosely by Congress, and therefore it ought to be construed, and probably will be construed by the courts, as liberally as possible to give effect to as much as possible of it. It is quite obvious that if members of Congress can assess anybody they please, the statute, so far as it is intended to protect inferior officers, would be wholly ineffectual. The action of the Attorney-General is, of course, a notification to the district-attorneys throughout the country that they need not trouble themselves about indicting anybody under the act. This is, to say the least, very unfortunate, since what is imperatively needed is a judicial construction of the act. The Attorney-General's idea seems to be that the meaning of the statute is so perfectly clear that it would be a mere waste of time to go into court with it. Some grand jury may yet, however, take a different view of the matter, for fortunately not even an opinion of the Attorney-General can prevent a grand jury from finding an indictment if they desire to do so.

Mr. A. A. Freeman, Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-office, has reviewed the opinion of the Circuit Court in the Curtis case, and his decision has been published in full. He holds that the anti-assessment statute is unconstitutional and void on several grounds, among which the most striking one is that the Constitution does not confer on Congress the power to pass such an act. This is so conclusive of itself that most men would have been content with it; but Mr. Freeman evidently has a cruel disposition, and does not mean to spare the judges who decided the case below. He therefore adds that the act violates "a principle of natural right older than any organized law—the right to use our own in any manner that we may see proper, provided we do not interfere with the rights of others." That this should have been overlooked by the

Court seems almost beyond belief, and it is no wonder that Mr. Freeman felt obliged to come out with it. Under ordinary circumstances we suppose he would enforce his decision by mandamus, but he seems to think that this is unnecessary, because the Supreme Court is going to overrule the Curtis case. His exact language is: "I have read the opinion of the Court in the Curtis case. The Court is in error, and the Supreme Court will so hold." But if he has a summary power of redress, is he not bound to exercise it? Has not the humblest citizen the right to have it exercised for his benefit?

The levying of assessments for political purposes has in the first place had the effect of making Mr. Hubbell, of Michigan, famous. This seems to please Mr. Hubbell, for his ambition is evidently rising, and he is intent upon keeping himself before the people. It appears that he wants to succeed Mr. Ferry in the Senate, while Mr. Ferry would be pleased to succeed himself. Mr. Hubbell, therefore, tries to persuade the people of Michigan that Mr. Ferry is not the right sort of man to represent them in the Senate, and to that end he sends to Michigan thousands of copies of a paper called the *Grand Army Journal*, in which Mr. Ferry is violently assailed. Mr. Ferry says in a letter to the First Assistant Postmaster-General that, as he is informed, the *Grand Army Journal* has never been a regular journal at all, but that the number in which he is assailed has been gotten up for the purpose, and is the first number published under that name, and he suggests that it is fraudulently transmitted through the mails as second-class matter, like regular journals. It is suggested also that Mr. Hubbell is carrying on his campaign against Senator Ferry with funds raised by assessment. How much truth there may be in these allegations we do not know; but it is certainly time that inquiry be made not only into the manner in which campaign funds are levied upon public servants, high and low, but into the purposes for which they are employed. It is very probable, indeed it has been shown in some instances, that money collected for the purpose of being used "against the common enemy" was used by one politician or by one faction against another within the same party—not to speak of other instances, in which its employment could not be traced at all. It is to be hoped that Senator Ferry will not rest until he has ascertained whether the *Grand Army Journal* with Mr. Hubbell's bombshell in it was published as a "Republican campaign document," and paid for out of the fund raised by assessments.

John B. Brownlow, a Post-office clerk, has published a letter giving his views of an attempt made by a little Tennessee "boss" named Houk, who happens to be a member of Congress, to prevent his expressing his opinion on the condition of politics in that State. Houk, he says, has been raising money in

Tennessee, not to beat the Democrats, but to defeat another Republican, named Rule, for the nomination in his district, and assessing everybody right and left for this purpose. Finding that Brownlow had the audacity to state, in conversation, that he preferred Rule, Houk, to bring him to his senses, wrote a letter threatening to "send him home to work for a living" if he did not keep quiet. Brownlow says, in reply and in print, that he proposes to do just as he pleases; that Rule is a truly good man, while Houk is somewhat like the "heathen Chinese," and, in comparison with his rival, is a "satyr to Hyperion"; that he neglects his duties in Congress, and keeps an "army of office-holders" riding for weeks "over twelve big counties, larger in extent of territory than the combined area of several States of the Union," "insolently dictating to the people the renomination of their little boss, Leonidas Caesar Houk." Mr. Brownlow adds that rather than outrage decency by supporting him any longer, he would willingly be disfranchised forever. The letter is a good illustration of the absolute desperation which the tyranny of the Machine produces in the minds of its victims. Here is this poor clerk, whose duty it is to look after the mails, and who ought to be as safe from molestation in doing it as any employee of a private merchant in this city, suddenly threatened with the loss of his place for saying that he prefers one man to another for Congress. To defend himself he publishes a torrent of abuse of the boss who does this, coupled with laudation of his opponent, in the hope that the latter may win the fight, and may, out of gratitude, keep him in. What a wonderful system it is!

Senator Frye's proposal of a commission of inquiry into the causes of the decline of American shipping has been seconded by a number of members of Congress; but the work of investigation has already been accomplished with some thoroughness, and with results which are daily attracting the attention, not only of thinkers and economists, but of practical men of business also. Mr. Frye could accomplish his purpose more effectually, besides saving a good deal of time, by sending to every member of Congress a copy of Mr. David A. Wells's 'Our Merchant Marine,' just published by G. P. Putnam's Sons. Without waiting for a commission, Senators and Representatives may learn from this volume just what the situation of American shipping is, and what has reduced it to its present low estate. Even before they read the book they may see at a glance, from the striking diagram which faces the title-page, what a melancholy falling away there has been. Mr. Wells shows, by means of proportionally reduced drawings of the American flag, how the export and import business covered by it has dwindled from 75.5 per cent. in 1855 to 16.2 per cent. in 1881. Whether by 1890 the flag in this comparison will have wholly disappeared, or whether it will gradually expand again until it regains something of its old and

honorable dimensions, is a question for Congress to answer; and it does not need the help of a commission in the matter.

Mr. Wells considers not only causes, but remedies also. Among the latter is one which Mr. Frye's commission probably would be asked to recommend—subsidies. Mr. Wells reinforces his own argument against this quack specific by the authority of the British Postmaster-General Fawcett, who, in a recent review of the subject, says that "there is an essential difference between a postal subsidy and one given on the building of a ship"; that the former is simply a payment for the conveyance of mail matter under certain specified conditions as to time and speed; and that in Great Britain such subsidies are so far from being granted to give English shipping protection against the competition of other countries, "that when a contract for the conveyance of mails is advertised no restriction whatever is imposed upon any foreign vessels competing." Mr. Fawcett mentions the interesting fact that "for some years a subsidy was paid by the English Post-office to a German steamship company for the conveyance of mails from Southampton to New York." This seems to dispose effectually of the familiar contention that the United States ought to hire Mr. Roach and other men on the Delaware to build merchant ships, because Great Britain does the like in regard to men on the Clyde.

The vote in the Senate on Thursday concurring in that clause of the House Tax Bill which removes all the bank taxes except that on circulation, renders it certain that if any bill passes, these taxes will be repealed. A great deal of demagoguery was enacted by Senator Voorhees, of Indiana, while the subject was under discussion, but the largeness of the majority (15 to 41) shows that he did not have the effective support of the Democratic members. Whatever influence the banks have in Congress will now be given to secure the passage of the bill as a whole. The repeal of the bank taxes has an importance over and above the question whether these taxes fall upon the banks, or upon the depositors, or upon the borrowers, or upon all three in certain proportions. It is quite certain that if the banks are relieved from this burden, they can issue circulating notes upon bonds bearing a lower rate of interest than heretofore. They can afford to take the new 3 per cents authorized to be exchanged for the extended 5's and 6's (now running at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.), and thus the Government will recover in another form a considerable portion of what is lost by the repeal of the taxes. As the redemption of the new 3's cannot take place till all the 3 $\frac{1}{2}$'s are paid off, the exchange will carry the national banking system along for three or four years at all events; but it will be incumbent on the next Congress to consider the question how the system shall be maintained, or what shall be substituted in place of it, when all the bonds shall be paid off, or when the procuring of bonds shall become so difficult and costly as to contract the circulation. A generation has grown up since the national banking system was adopted, to whom accordingly it appears

that there can be no bank-notes where there are no Government bonds. It will take time and labor to remove this erroneous impression, and for this reason the consideration of measures, whatever they may be, in substitution of the existing system, should not be postponed to the last moment.

Panama Canal building has been going on so actively—on paper—that the enterprise was supposed to have got a discouragingly long start of the Nicaragua scheme. On Friday, however, a new impulse was given to the latter undertaking in the form of a report by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs favorable to a bill "to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua." By its terms the capital stock is to consist of not less than 500,000 or more than 1,000,000 shares at \$100 each—a total of from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000. The canal must be at least 150 feet wide and 28 feet deep, and the locks not less than 600 feet long. The kernel of the scheme is a guarantee by the United States that for twenty years the net annual receipts of the canal shall not be less than three per cent. of the total cost of the work. It is provided, however, that this estimate shall be made upon a cost not exceeding \$75,000,000, and that the yearly expenses of maintenance and operation shall not exceed \$1,000,000. It is an interesting question how fast the subscriptions would pour in in the absence of this guarantee; but, with the endorsement of a Government whose credit is so good as that of the United States, Mr. Kasson, who made the report, is perhaps justified in believing that, in view of what "nature has herself accomplished" for this one of the ten routes which have been surveyed across the Isthmus, and considering other helpful circumstances, the company may succeed. The bill provides that the Government may use the canal when necessary for the transportation of troops, and may assume its management "temporarily or otherwise" when it sees fit. It is not likely, however, that with a guarantee of annual dividends to the amount of \$2,250,000 the company would force the Government to take charge of the enterprise for twenty years at least. Mr. Kasson says that probably the United States will never be called upon to make good its guarantee, and altogether takes almost as cheerful a view of the future of Nicaragua as M. de Lesseps himself takes in regard to Panama. But such predictions are always made, even in cases where the Government finally is obliged to foot the bills.

General Grant has written a letter to the Mexican Minister, Mr. Romero, stating the attitude of the United States with regard to the boundary dispute between Mexico and Guatemala with as much positiveness as if he were himself the head, or rather the embodiment, of the Government of the Republic. He adds, indeed, that he is "not, of course, authorized to say a word for the Administration on this subject." But he is certain to know what it is going to do, and so informs the plenipotentiary of the foreign Power interested in the matter, kindly relieving the President and the Secretary of State of that trouble. General Grant's exploits of private diplomacy

in China have already accustomed the people of this country to his eccentricities in this regard, so that a repetition of them appears rather harmless. It must be said, also, that the contents of General Grant's letter are on the whole very sensible, and stand in remarkably wholesome contrast to some of his official utterances as President of the United States. He is especially emphatic on the matter of annexation, telling the Mexican Minister not to give himself any concern as to the offer of territory which President Barrios of Guatemala, as reported, is prepared to make to our Government. "Annexation of territory," says General Grant, "will have but few advocates, and the treatment by the press of the country of such men as advocated interference in foreign countries, shows that any scheme of that kind would be extremely unpopular. . . . I am certain that I know the sentiment of the country on the question of annexation." There are some of us who remember that General Grant, when he had the San Domingo annexation scheme "on the brain," utterly refused to listen to "the sentiment of the country on the question of annexation," and even in his last message reasserted his conviction of the immense advantage of that acquisition of territory, and of the folly of the opposition to it. It is pleasant to observe a capacity to learn, even in elderly and headstrong men.

Shipherd has at length given to the press the testimony which the House Foreign Affairs Committee refused in May last to receive. It contains his correspondence with General Grant, and shows the means by which the adventurer contrived to elevate himself temporarily into the position of a public character. In October, 1881, he sends to General Grant a memorandum of the instructions which he thinks the Secretary of State ought to send to our Minister at Lima, and asks the General to "please say in a word if it seems to you too strong in view of the enormous interests at stake and the critical situation." The instructions embraced the following: "Notify Peru and Chili peremptorily that no adjustment will be allowed which does not provide, to the satisfaction of this Department, for payment of Landreau and adjudication of Cochet claims; and insist on *status quo* meanwhile. Avoid absolutely *Société Industrielle*." This was sent back by General Grant, Shipherd says, with the following endorsement: "The enclosed is what I think the Secretary of State should send, in view of his instructions to Hurlbut and the latter's actions, as I understand the matter. But I can ask nothing and expect nothing from the present Secretary of State." This was, of course, the mere expression of an opinion—a very extraordinary opinion, no doubt—coupled with a refusal to do anything. Still, it appears to have answered Shipherd's purpose, and he probably showed it to all the other statesmen and diplomats who, he says, were associated with him, as containing General Grant's views on the Chili-Peruvian crisis.

Mr. Trescott has written a letter to Mr. Blaine in which he makes a benevolent attempt to extricate that gentleman from the awkward position in which the Chili-Peruvian

investigation has left him. He declares Mr. Blaine to have acted in a consistent manner with regard to the *Crédit Industriel* from the first; that the idea of his "designing a war" is "too absurd for serious consideration"; that in regard to the Cochet claim, he rejected it absolutely; while as to the Landreau claim he merely suggested an adjudication. From this it will be seen that Mr. Trescot takes the Blaine view of the whole affair. What he says is, however, no more than the expression of an opinion as to the proper construction to be put upon certain acts of Mr. Blaine which have all been made public, and as to which Mr. Trescot is no better qualified to reach a conclusion than a thousand other people. Mr. Trescot's reason for thinking that Mr. Blaine could not have intended to involve the country in a war reflects greater credit upon his heart than upon his head. He says that he is quite sure about this, because Mr. Blaine always declared to him that it was not war but peace that he wanted. He would have declined the mission, he says, if he had thought otherwise. The reason why most people think that Mr. Blaine meant war, is that while talking about peace he kept exasperating the Chilians, so that it was obvious that sooner or later they must be forced into war. If, while uttering beautiful sentiments about peace and good-will, you double up your fist and shake it in a man's eyes, and encourage your friends to surround him with loud cries and threats, he will sooner or later come to the conclusion that your intentions are hostile. Mr. Trescot seems to think that it is impossible to say peace and mean war, so that his letter must not only be very satisfactory, but very amusing, to Mr. Blaine.

Judge Wylie's decision to admit Walsh's testimony in the Star-route trial gives the prosecution an important advantage. The decision is limited to holding that testimony of admissions by any one of the conspirators can be received so far as they affect him, but not his fellow-conspirators. Walsh's story is that Brady admitted to him in 1880 that he was in the habit of getting twenty per cent. on "expeditions" from all the contractors, and demanded it of him. The jury will, of course, be instructed very carefully that this affects no one but Brady, as they will be in regard to the "Rerdell confession," which has likewise been admitted. But the rules of law with regard to evidence in conspiracy cases are so elaborate and hard to follow, that probably no jury in arriving at its verdict in such a case ever knows whether it is applying them correctly or not. When a jury once gets hold of a conspiracy case it tries it generally in a much simpler way than any reader of Greenleaf on Evidence would think possible.

The Georgia Democrats, in their State Convention, on the 19th inst., abandoned the "time-honored" two-thirds rule. This rule is time-honored for various reasons. It enables one-third of the body to prevent the nomination of a candidate who is favored by a large majority of the representatives of a party and perhaps also of its members. It used to enable the

politicians of the slave States, though in a minority, to control national conventions. It has been said that the two-thirds rule guarantees harmony and promotes enthusiasm. How it does this is not clear, since, as we have seen, it may easily disappoint and exasperate a very large majority of the party, and as much as it often results in the nomination of a candidate whom nobody wants, not even the minority. It is an encouraging sign of progress that the Georgia Democrats have repealed this rule. As regards Mr. Alexander H. Stephens's acceptance of the nomination for the Governorship, it might be asked whether the Democratic Bourbons have come to him, or he has gone to them. A similar question might have been asked when Mr. Stephens, as a Union man, cast his lot with the Rebellion. His mind was undoubtedly full of good intentions as to the beneficent influence he was going to exercise, but the Rebellion was much stronger than he, and he did not exercise any influence at all. Some time ago he was spoken of as the candidate of the "Independents" in Georgia, a position for which his expressed or implied opinions would have well fitted him. But, as in 1861 the Secessionists thought it an important thing to capture him as the ablest and most respected Union man in the State, so the Democratic Bourbons have thought it a useful thing to capture the most respected Democrat of an "independent" reputation. The result will probably be the same. If Mr. Stephens had any strong purpose in running for Governor, there would undoubtedly have been some intimation of it in the platform, which was made by a committee composed exclusively of Mr. Stephens's friends, and may have been written by himself. But there is absolutely nothing in it of the least significance unless it be the denunciation of the Government for its efforts to collect internal-revenue taxes in Georgia.

In the Democratic Convention of Ohio the "Young Democrats" seem to have been overshadowed by the old "war horses." This is not surprising, for if the Young Democrats were fairly represented by Mr. Bookwalter, the last Democratic candidate for Governor in Ohio, it is difficult to see what constitutes their claim to political power. There were only three candidates to be nominated this year—one for Secretary of State, one for Supreme Judge, and one for the Board of Public Works. It is reported that the nominations made by the Democrats are uncommonly strong. Their platform is much better than that of the Georgia Democrats, without, however, being very clear and specific. It favors "honest reform in the civil service" and a "tariff levied to meet actual needs," which is also "to encourage productive industries and afford labor just compensation without creating monopolies," whatever that may mean. A resolution opposing "legislation merely sumptuary" is obviously aimed at the German Republicans, who are dissatisfied with the so-called Pond Law and the Sunday Law. The Democrats expect to make large gains in that quarter, and their expectation is to some extent likely to be realized. A significant feature of the Convention was the part played in it by Senator Pendleton, who

presided, and delivered what appears to have been the principal speech at a ratification meeting in the evening. In this he ignored civil-service reform almost altogether, and devoted himself principally to crude lucubrations about the foreign policy of this country, apparently trying to out-Blaine Mr. Blaine himself.

The news of the week respecting the crops was the main reason for buoyant and active markets at the Stock Exchange, and for depression and lower prices at the Produce Exchange. This news, in a word, was that the yield of wheat and of every variety of grass crop will be the largest on record, and that the corn crop promises to be but little below the average. The decline in the prices of food products at the Produce Exchange has been somewhat modified by the prospect of an extraordinary foreign demand for them during the coming year, inasmuch as the harvests in Europe are below expectations. All railroad securities were also strengthened by the report of the Advisory Commission appointed by the trunk-line railroads to consider the question of differential rates. The Commissioners favor maintaining the present differences, which are against New York; but the opinion is that the report will be accepted by the New York roads, and that then all differences between the trunk-line roads will be settled on a firmer basis than ever before, and that the policy of the roads will be to get profitable rates instead of to injure one another, as last year. The rise in the prices of stocks ranged from 1 to 17 points; and in railroad bonds, from 1 to 8½. United States bonds advanced ¼@1 for the long issues, and declined ¼@½ for the short-date issues. The money market was easy at low rates, although the New York banks lost about \$2,500,000 of their surplus reserve. While foreign exchange ruled considerably below the gold-exporting point, about \$1,500,000 gold was shipped for the account of the Italian Government. Rates in the London money market remain low, and the foreign demand for American securities was large; one negotiation of \$3,000,000 Northern Pacific bonds was made for the German markets.

The accounts of the atrocities committed by Arab ruffians in the interior of Egypt, as they gradually come in, grow more and more horrible, and are calculated seriously to diminish the sympathy with the "nascent nationality" which some discerned in Arabi's movements. There has been some slight skirmishing between the British advance and Arabi's forces, the result of which will probably be the restoration of the fresh-water supply upon which Alexandria depends. The only sign of bravery the Egyptians have so far shown was that their cavalry galloped gallantly forward and then galloped back again as soon as they were shot at. The British are now trying to bring heavy artillery to the front, with which they expect to dislodge Arabi's force from his position near Ramleh, in which place the British have established themselves. The message of the Queen calling out the reserves on account of the difficulties in Egypt shows that the British Government is taking a somewhat more serious view of the obstacles to be overcome than before.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, July 19, to THURSDAY, July 25, 1882, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

In the Senate on Wednesday, Mr. Beck's amendment to the Internal-Revenue Bill, reducing the tax on tobacco to twelve cents a pound, was adopted after a long discussion. The discussion of the bill was made very spirited on Thursday by a reply from Senator Harrison, of Indiana, to his colleague, Senator Voorhees, who recently made a high-tariff speech. Mr. Harrison showed that Senator Voorhees did not truly represent the Democratic party of Indiana by his sentiments on the revenue question. The Committee amendment, removing the bank tax, was adopted. On Friday, snuff was included with tobacco in the tax reduction, and a motion made by Mr. Bayard, of Delaware, to strike out matches from the list of articles from which the stamp tax is to be removed, was lost, by a vote of 8 to 45. The first section, as amended, was finally passed on Saturday.

A proposed amendment to the Revenue Bill, further reducing the tax on manufactured tobacco to eight cents per pound, was lost in the Senate on Monday, by a vote of 18 to 38.

The Senate has refused to confirm D. Lanning, a Stalwart Republican, whom President Arthur nominated to succeed Postmaster Cleveland, at Penn Yan, N. Y. The latter gentleman was removed without sufficient cause. The vote stood 28 to 30, twelve Republicans voting in the negative.

Filibustering began in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, when the South Carolina contested-election case of Tillman and Smalls was taken up by the Republicans. A quorum of Republicans was obtained with difficulty, and, after a speech by Mr. Tillman, in which he openly defended the recent gerrymandering in South Carolina, and did not deny that there had been intimidation of colored voters, his seat was given to Mr. Smalls, the Republican contestant, by a vote of 141 to 5.

The House Committee on Pacific Railroads on Wednesday voted to postpone until December further consideration of the bill to aid in improving the navigation of the Mississippi River, by constructing a levee from Memphis to the Yazoo River.

On Thursday the House declared the seat of Mr. Shelley, a Democratic member from Alabama, vacant, by a vote of 145 to 1. His Republican contestant is dead. The conference report on the River and Harbor Bill was presented. It reduces the aggregate amount of specific appropriations contained in the bill as it passed the Senate about \$350,000.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs made a report on Friday favorable to a bill to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company, of Nicaragua. By its terms the capital stock is to consist of not less than fifty nor more than one hundred million dollars. The United States is to guarantee that for twenty years the net annual receipts of the canal shall not be less than three per cent. of the total cost of the work. The same committee unanimously resolved not to accept a statement from Mr. Blaine in reply to Mr. Robert E. Randall's recent contradiction of Mr. Blaine's previous testimony in regard to the Crédit Industriel.

A minority report of the House Judiciary Committee, presented to the full Committee on Friday, sets forth that the remainder of the Northern Pacific Railroad land grant unpatented to this date should be restored to the public domain, for occupation by actual settlers under existing laws.

A bill providing for the issue of postal notes for sums not exceeding five dollars was passed in the House on Friday. The notes are not redeemable after three months, and the fee is to be three cents. The following reductions were also made in the fees charged for money orders: on orders not exceeding \$10, 8 cents; not exceeding \$15, 10 cents; not

exceeding \$30, 15 cents; not exceeding \$40, 20 cents; not exceeding \$60, 25 cents; not exceeding \$70, 35 cents; not exceeding \$80, 40 cents; not exceeding \$100, 45 cents.

The question of free ships was brought before the House on Saturday in an unexpected manner. Mr. Kasson reported a bill the purpose of which is to extend to vessels built in the United States on foreign account, partly of domestic and partly of foreign materials, the same drawback that is at present allowed on a manufactured article constructed wholly of imported materials—that is, a drawback to the amount of duties paid, less ten per cent. Mr. Tucker, a Virginia Democrat, moved to amend the bill, making it apply to vessels built for domestic as well as foreign account. The amendment was forced to a vote, but the Republicans abstained, leaving the House without a quorum voting. Further dilatory tactics were resorted to by the Republicans until the hour was up, when the bill went over.

In the Criminal Court, at Washington, on Wednesday, argument was begun in the Star-route trials, before Judge Wylie, as to the admissibility of the testimony of John A. Walsh. It was understood that the decision of this question would also affect the admission of the Rordell confession, and upon this piece of evidence much of the prosecution's success depends. The defence contended that a confession of a fellow-conspirator could not be accepted against an associate; that the confession could not be used against himself until the conspiracy had been otherwise proved; that a confession of acts not done in the furtherance of the objects of the conspiracy could not be received. On Friday Judge Wylie decided that testimony of admissions by any one of the conspirators could be received as far as they affected him, but not his fellow-conspirators. Walsh was then called, and testified as to Brady's admitting to him that he got twenty per cent. on "expeditions" from all contractors, and he demanded the same from Walsh.

The Court in banc of the criminal branch of the United States Circuit Court rendered a decision on Thursday in the case of Gen. Newton M. Curtis, ex-special agent of the Treasury Department, who was indicted for, tried, and convicted of collecting money from office-holders for political purposes. The motion for a new trial and the arrest of judgment was denied, and the validity of the statute upon which the prosecution was based was affirmed. General Curtis was sentenced to pay a fine of \$1,000, and stand committed until the fine was paid. General Curtis was committed to the custody of his counsel, who was sworn as a Deputy United States Marshal. The counsel immediately applied to Chief Justice Waite of the United States Supreme Court for a writ of habeas corpus and certiorari. On Monday they were signed and made returnable before the Supreme Court in October.

The Tariff Commission is now holding daily meetings at Long Branch. The Commission holds an executive session in the morning at eleven o'clock. At two in the afternoon there is a public session, at which those who desire to be heard on the tariff question are given an opportunity. The first point to be considered by the Commission is a free list.

The report of Messrs. Allen G. Thurman, E. D. Washburne, and Thomas M. Cooley, the Advisory Commission selected by the New York Central and Hudson River, the New York, Lake Erie and Western, the Pennsylvania, and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Companies, to advise them upon the differences in rates that should exist, both eastwardly and westwardly, upon all classes of freights between the several terminal Atlantic ports, has been published. It sets forth that no evidence has been offered to show that the existing rates are unjust, or that they operate to the prejudice of any of the Atlantic seaboard cities. They, therefore, have no further recommendation to make, except that the whole

matter must be left where it is, in the hands of the railroads.

General J. Rufino Barrios, President of the Republic of Guatemala, is now in this country. He went to Washington on Wednesday, and during the week many official courtesies have been extended to him. He hopes to obtain the good offices of the United States in settling the long disputed boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala.

The National Greenback-Labor State Convention, at a meeting in Albany on Wednesday, nominated the following ticket: for Governor, Epenetus Howe, of Tompkins Co.; for Lieutenant-Governor, James Allen, of Brooklyn; for Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, L. J. McParlin, of Niagara County; for Congressman-at-large, L. G. McDonald, of Glens Falls. The platform adopted reaffirms that of the National Convention of the party in 1880, until the next National Convention adopts another; it calls for reform in the management of railroads by the State, repeal of certain sections of the penal code, and the regulation of prison labor; it asserts that all land owned by individuals or corporations in excess of what is required for their personal use, or for the transaction of business, should be taxed so as to render its ownership valueless.

The Regular Republican Executive Committee of Pennsylvania, to whom was referred the proposition of the Independent candidates for the absolute withdrawal of both tickets from the field, have written a letter stating that the difference between the Independent candidates is so wide that it practically bars any further attempt at negotiations on the basis they propose. They further state that their four propositions exhaust the powers granted them by their Convention. This virtually puts an end to all efforts at compromise, and it is probable that the war between the factions will be fought out in the campaign.

The State Convention of the Ohio Democrats was held on Wednesday and Thursday, and J. W. Newman, of Portsmouth, was nominated for Secretary of State, John W. Oakey for Supreme Judge, and Henry Weible for Board of Public Works. The platform contains a vigorous denunciation of political assessments, and a plea for civil-service reform; it favors a tariff levied to meet actual wants, a bi-metallic standard, anti-monopoly legislation, and a more ardent protection of American citizens in foreign lands. Senator Pendleton, of Ohio, spoke at a ratification meeting on Thursday evening. He devoted himself especially to a denunciation of the foreign policy of the present Administration, and favored extending the influence of the United States among the nations of the American Continent.

In the Georgia Democratic Convention, on Wednesday, the majority rule was adopted, by a vote of 195 to 164. Alexander H. Stephens and A. O. Bacon were put in nomination for the Governorship. On Thursday morning Mr. Bacon's name was withdrawn and Mr. Stephens was nominated, there being only eight scattering votes against him. The rest of the State ticket was then nominated, and a platform adopted which reaffirms the principles of the Jeffersonian Democracy; charges the present National Administration with a corrupt use of the Executive patronage; and condemns the present mode of raiding upon illicit distillers.

The Texas Democrats have nominated John Ireland for Governor. He is a practising lawyer of considerable reputation, and has served as State Senator and Supreme Judge.

A decision of the Connecticut Supreme Court, on Wednesday, establishes the eligibility of women to be admitted to practice in the courts of the State.

An earthquake shock of ten seconds' duration was felt in Cairo, Ill., on Thursday morning.

At half-past two o'clock on Wednesday morning the steamer *Rhode Island*, of the

Providence line, was run into by the *Alhambra*, of the New York and Halifax Steamship Company. The *Alhambra* struck the *Rhode Island* on the port side, and tore out the wheel-house and some of the upper works, completely demolishing the wheel. The only person injured was the colored barber of the *Rhode Island*, who was asleep in his chair. He was crushed into a very small space, and so hemmed in by timbers that it was necessary to cut him out. His injuries were not fatal.

The widow of Abraham Lincoln was buried in the Lincoln tomb at Springfield, Ill., on Wednesday. The officers of the State of Ohio attended the funeral in a body.

Miss Fanny Parnell, sister of Charles Stewart Parnell, the Irish leader, and granddaughter of Commodore Charles Stewart, known as "Old Ironsides," died suddenly of heart disease on Thursday, at the family home in Bordentown, N. J. She was twenty-eight years of age. Many branches of the Ladies' Land League in this country were organized by her.

Col. John Church Hamilton, a son of Alexander Hamilton, died on July 25, at Long Branch, in the ninetyeth year of his age. He was the editor of *Memoirs* and the *Works* of his father, and wrote a 'History of the Republic,' which was published in 1858.

FOREIGN.

It became evident on Wednesday that the work of the British fleet at Alexandria was about ended, and that thereafter land troops would be needed to carry on the campaign. The ships of the reserve squadron were ordered to return to their several stations. Dervish Pasha left Alexandria for Constantinople, and the British felt relieved at his departure, for it was believed that he acted in collusion with Arabi Pasha, and it was asserted that he received a communication from him but a few hours before starting for Constantinople. Arabi Pasha's defence, which was published in Constantinople, maintained that the bombardment of Alexandria was a hostile act to Egypt, and contrary to the rights of the Sultan; and that he was fully justified by law and by the decision of the Council of Ministers in replying to the British fire. The Khedive, he argued, in accepting British soldiers as a body-guard, showed that he considered the Egyptian Army as enemies. The delay of the British troops gave encouragement to Arabi, and his forces increased rapidly.

Arabi Pasha continued his aggressive operations on Thursday. Having erected fortifications just opposite Abukir Bay, and upon the Mahmudieh fresh-water canal which supplies Alexandria, he placed a dam in the canal below his position, and cut the banks above the dam so as to send water along the front of his fortifications. Sufficient water remains in the canal below the dam to supply Alexandria for about three weeks. The country in front of Arabi's defences is flooded knee-deep, making the ground too soft for the movement of guns. Arabi secured his forces after the battle at Alexandria by spreading a report that the English had been defeated, and that eight iron-clads had been sunk, two burned, and four captured. He also issued a proclamation, announcing irreconcilable war with the English. The Notables supported Arabi by meeting at Cairo, declaring the Khedive a traitor, and deposing him. Arabi has levied a war-tax upon the land to the amount of \$2,500,000. He is well supplied with provisions and ammunition.

Major-General Alison on Saturday morning moved out from Alexandria with two regiments of infantry and a mounted squadron toward Arabi's entrenchments. These troops occupied Abukir. Two hundred and fifty rifles, under an aide-de-camp of General Alison, pushed beyond Milaha to blow up the railway. They met some of Arabi's cavalry, and several shots were exchanged. The Egyptians fled after losing two dead and several wounded.

The Khedive published, on Sunday, two proclamations, one to Arabi Pasha, dismissing him formally from the Ministry of War, for his persistency in war preparations and his refusal to go to the Khedive after receiving orders; the other is a proclamation to the Army, calling on them to abjure Arabi's authority, and obey the Khedive. In reply to the proclamation, Arabi appointed a Minister of his own at Cairo. It is thought probable that he will destroy that city unless defeated. His force was estimated on Monday at 8,000 men, thirty-six field pieces, and six Gatling guns.

Refugees flocked to Alexandria on Sunday and Monday from the interior and from Cairo. Horrible reports were brought of the atrocities committed. At Tintah, eighty-five Europeans were tortured and torn in pieces; women were violated and tortured. At Tulkh, the throats of two Germans were cut as they were about to enter a railway carriage. Soldiers have participated in the outrages, but Arabi's Government has issued a proclamation that every native molesting Christians will be shot. This is thought to be a mere form which may give them immunity if they should fall into the hands of the Europeans hereafter. Ragheb Bey was arrested on board a mail steamer from Constantinople, at Alexandria, on Sunday. Papers were found in his possession which showed that he had been acting as Arabi's agent for carrying communications between him and the Palace and Pan-Islamic Committee at Constantinople. He was promised lenity if he confessed, and he gave a complete list of the persons with whom Arabi has been connected, both in Constantinople and Egypt. It is rumored that Arabi has threatened to depose the house of Osman, and proclaim that of Yezid ruler in its place.

The Sixteenth Rifles (English) marched from Alexandria to occupy Ramleh on Monday morning. Arabi's front fell back on Sunday evening to the other side of Ramleh, forcing this operation. The British troops stationed one Gatling and a field gun at the bridge over the canal. The enemy's cavalry appeared and galloped along the railway at three hundred yards' range, but fled at the first volley from the guns. They afterward reappeared with two guns and opened fire with little effect on the British troops. By three o'clock in the afternoon the fighting was finished. The casualties were insignificant, and the British troops remained in occupation of Ramleh.

M. de Freycinet, the French Premier, in conference with the Senate Committee on the Naval Credit, on Monday, said that if the Powers indirectly interested in Egypt remained neutral in regard to the intervention in Egypt, France would leave England to act alone, and would confine herself to the protection of the Suez Canal.

On Thursday the Porte replied to the identical note of the Powers in regard to the despatch of Turkish troops to Egypt as follows: "If the Porte has not hitherto decided on its own initiative to send troops to Egypt, it is because it was convinced that vigorous measures were avoidable. Observing with satisfaction that the Powers have formally and repeatedly recorded their deference to the incontestable and unquestioned rights and sovereignty of the Sultan, the undersigned, by the Sultan's order, informs the Ambassadors that the Porte consents to participate in the Conference." The Ambassadors of the Powers at Constantinople, in view of the importance of again asking the Porte to join the Conference, telegraphed to their respective Governments, asking speedy instructions. On Friday the Sultan appointed Assym Pasha and Said Pasha as Turkish delegates to the Conference.

A long despatch from Earl Granville, English Foreign Secretary, to Lord Dufferin, the English Ambassador at Constantinople, dated July 11, has been published. After justifying the bombardment of Alexandria, the despatch asserts that England's Government now sees no

alternative but a recourse to force to put an end to the disorders in Egypt. If the Sultan will not furnish the force, Her Majesty's Government holds that the intervention should represent the united action and authority of Europe.

One hundred Conservative Peers met at Lord Salisbury's residence in London on Friday and decided to allow the Irish Arrears Bill to pass its second reading in the House of Lords, but to introduce amendments to the bill in Committee. The proposed amendments will not touch the question of loan or gift, but will provide that application for dealing with arrears shall be optional for both landlord and tenant, and the tenant's right of holding shall be considered an asset. Lord Salisbury, on account of the gravity of foreign affairs, did not recommend the rejection of the bill, and a consequent crisis.

The House of Commons on Friday passed Mr. Trevelyan's new clause to the Arrears Bill to its second reading. It provides that Boards of Guardians shall have power to borrow money at 3½ per cent. to promote emigration. The bill then passed its third reading.

Colonel Brackenbury, Director of the Irish Criminal Investigation Department, has resigned. He has not been able to work harmoniously with the Lord Lieutenant.

Crops in the northwest of Ireland are in a very bad condition. Hay is lying cut in the fields, surrounded by water, and potatoes are blighted.

Mr. Bradlaugh and three other freethinkers were committed for trial on Friday, in London, on the charge of publishing blasphemous libels. Mr. Bradlaugh was afterward admitted to bail in the sum of \$500.

It is reported in London that Mr. John Bright will visit America during the Parliamentary recess.

In London, the prospectus has been issued of the European, American, Canadian, and Asiatic Cable Company, with a capital of \$7,500,000. It proposes to work at the rate of nine pence a word.

The rifle team of England won the Elcho Shield in the competition at Wimbledon, England, on Thursday. Ireland was 31 points behind England, and Scotland 11 points behind Ireland.

In the French Chamber of Deputies, on Wednesday, M. Goblet, Minister of the Interior and of Worship, replying to a Radical interpellation, demanding the establishment of a central Mayoralty for Paris, moved the order of the day, pure and simple, which was rejected, by a vote of 278 to 172. The Chamber adopted, by a vote of 218 to 176, an order of the day hostile to the creation of a central Mayoralty. In consequence of these votes, Premier de Freycinet placed the resignations of himself and colleagues in the hands of President Grévy, who urgently begged them to withdraw them. On Thursday several Deputies declared in the Chamber that their votes were not aimed at the Cabinet. M. Ferry stated that President Grévy would not accept the resignations. The Chamber finally passed, by a vote of 276 to 105, an order of the day implying confidence in the Government, and leaving aside the Mayoralty question. This ended the crisis. M. Goblet resumed his post, but said he would not abandon any part of his programme.

M. Floquet, Prefect of the Department of the Seine, France, and a great partisan of the Paris Mayoralty, resigned on Friday. The resignation has not yet been accepted.

Mr. George P. Marsh, the eminent philologist, for twenty-one years the United States Minister to Italy, died suddenly in Vallombrosa, Italy, on Monday, at the age of eighty-one. He was the senior member of our diplomatic service.

A great fire at Smyrna, on Wednesday, destroyed 1,400 houses, and rendered 6,000 people homeless. Only one life was reported lost.

THE DECISION IN THE CURTIS CASE.

THE three judges of the Circuit Court, in sentencing General Curtis for levying assessments on Government employees, place their decision on grounds so broad as to strike at the root of the abuse. The act under which General Curtis was indicted prohibits "all executive officers or employees of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate," from "requesting, giving to, or receiving from any other officer or employee of the Government any money, or property, or other thing of value for political purposes." Now, the Court says that it "cannot profess to be ignorant" that the law was passed for the express purpose of preventing the continuance of "practices which had become a topic of extended animadversion," and the first question raised by the defendant was, whether Congress had the power to prevent them by such means. He insisted that Congress has no constitutional power to make the requesting or giving of voluntary contributions for political purposes a criminal offence. The Court disposes of this defence very effectually by calling attention to the fact that the prohibition applies only where there is "concerted action between officials." It is, in other words, a gift by one official to another, or a demand by one official upon another, which is prohibited, not donations by or demands upon private persons.

The right of Congress to make regulations for the discipline of the public service cannot be questioned, and Congress must necessarily exercise its judgment and discretion in determining what acts have a tendency to impair discipline. With this discretion courts of justice cannot interfere unless it has been plainly transgressed—*e. g.*, should Congress undertake to prohibit "an act of a nature pertaining so exclusively to the sphere of private conduct that it could not by any implication impinge upon official deportment or official discipline." But the acts prohibited by this statute are not of such a character. "We cannot affirm that Congress transcended its discretion in prohibiting transactions between officials which create the relation of donor and donee, and introduce party interests into the public service; nor that Congress erred in assuming that the influences springing from this relation and these interests should be discouraged as liable to deflect the independence and impartiality which must rule official intercourse." As an instance of this sort of legislation, the Court cites the act of February 1, 1870, prohibiting employees from making gifts to their superior officers. It is not necessary, the judges say, that the coöperation of officials in raising funds for political purposes should be essentially "subversive of discipline." It is enough to justify the exercise of the legislative discretion "if the prohibited acts tend to introduce interests which disturb the just equipoise of official relations." As to the "right and duty of every good citizen to aid in promoting such political objects as he deems to be wise and beneficial," the Court further says: "The answer is that no citizen is required to hold a public office, and if he is unwilling to do so upon such conditions as are prescribed by that department of the Govern-

ment which creates the office, fixes its tenure, and regulates its incidents, it is his duty to resign."

No one who wishes to see the public service of the country managed on rational and honest principles can fail to be greatly encouraged by this decision; but it has to be looked at in connection with the opinion which has just been given by the Attorney-General, to the effect that members of Congress are not "officers" of the Government within the meaning of the act, and consequently employees are not forbidden by it to pay the assessments levied upon them by Mr. Hubbell and his committee.

The gist of the Attorney-General's opinion may be gathered from the following extracts:

"It seems that a member of Congress is not an officer of the United States in the constitutional meaning of the term. In the case of Blount, on an impeachment before the Senate in 1799, the question arose whether a Senator was a civil officer of the United States within the purview of the Constitution, and the Senate decided that he was not. This question arose under the fourth section of the second article of the Constitution. 'Other clauses of the Constitution,' observes Judge Story in Section 733 of his work on the Constitution, 'would seem to favor the same result, particularly the clauses respecting appointments of officers of the United States by the Executive, who is to commission all of the officers of the United States; and the sixth section of the first article, which declares that 'no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office'; and the first section of the second article, which declares that 'no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector.'" To these clauses may be added that in the section of the fourteenth article which provides that 'no person shall be a Senator,' etc., who, having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress or as an officer of the United States, etc.

"These clauses show a marked discrimination between members of Congress and officers, the latter term, in the sense in which it is there used, not including legislators.

"In the penal legislation of Congress a like discrimination is made. . . . In legislation of this character the word 'officer' appears to be uniformly employed in a sense not more comprehensive than that in which it is employed in the Constitution as above; that is to say, not in that broad and general sense which would include members of the legislative branch of the Government."

This cannot be considered as conclusive. It is surprising to find a lawyer of Mr. Brewster's standing citing the Blount case as a precedent; for, in the first place, the record of his trial does not make plain on what ground the decision should be placed, and the difference between a Senator, an officer chosen by a State, and a Representative, whose office is entirely Federal, is very wide.

As to the citations of statutes in which the word is used in such a way as to show that members of Congress cannot be intended, other acts, as, for instance, the Test Oath Act, and the act of 1874 "repealing the increase of salaries of members of Congress and other officers," are in conflict with these, and have been called to the attention of the Attorney-General by the counsel for the Civil-Service Reform League. The reason why he is silent about them is very obvious. Had he referred to them, he would have been obliged to admit that the question is by no means clear, and that it is really one for the satisfactory settlement of which judicial construction is required.

Still, whether the Attorney-General is right or wrong, the important result of the Curtis case is that the practice of collecting political

assessments has been judicially determined to be an abuse. Whether the language of the present act prevents the penalty being enforced if the assessments are levied by members of Congress cannot affect the principle of the decision. What is needed is a stringent and sweeping and perfectly plain act which any one can construe for himself, that will make it impossible for the Hubbells or the Curtises or anybody to continue the work, and that Congress will be forced into passing such an act before long we have little doubt.

The broad grounds on which the opinion of the Court is rested show that such legislation need not by any means be confined, careful as the judges are to point out that it is so confined in the existing statute, to cases of "coöperation" in raising money between officials. Every reason which is mentioned for punishing such coöperation is a reason for making it a criminal offence for anybody, in private or public life, to levy political blackmail. The criminality of the practice consists in its introducing a sinister influence into the service, and perverting the views as to official duty prevailing in it. This influence is just as dangerous and strong, whether this or that form of machinery be resorted to to raise the tax. Whether the tax-gatherer is a member of Congress, or Treasury agent, or a mere volunteer, his enterprise, on the principles announced in this decision, is an offence against the United States, which Congress can make a crime and punish, just as it can an attempt to tamper with the mails or defraud the Custom-house.

Important as are the practical legal consequences of the decision, its moral effect is, perhaps, still more so. The most serious obstacle the enemies of any established abuse have to contend with is that it gets in time to be regarded as part of the natural order of things, so that those engaged in perpetuating it are really felt to be doing nothing more than the circumstances of the case make it customary to do. No one feels very badly about another man's doing what he thinks he would probably do in his place. The work of reforming abuses consists very largely in replacing the feeling that a practice is an indifferent one morally, by the feeling that it is reprehensible and must be stopped. Nothing is so well calculated to bring this about as a decision that the practice is an abuse, accompanied by a simple, straightforward statement of the reasons why it must be so regarded. How great a help such a decision is likely to give the cause of civil-service reform, a very slight consideration of the disastrous effect a contrary result would have had may suggest.

DIFFERENTIAL RATES.

THE report of the Railroad Advisory Commission on the subject of "differential rates" between the West and the seaboard is in substance that they have no recommendations to make. Under the present system, which they have been engaged in examining, the trunk lines make higher charges for the transportation of freight to New York and Boston than to Philadelphia and Baltimore. Taking the charges on Eastward-bound freight from Chicago to New York as the standard, the charges to Boston are the same, those to Philadelphia two cents, and

those to Baltimore three cents, per hundred pounds less. These differences are the result of a compromise between the roads, and the Commission was appointed to inquire and report upon the differences that should be made, and whether any changes were required. The Commission, consisting of Messrs. Thurman, Washburne, and Cooley, is as able and impartial a body as could have been selected for the work, and their report that no evidence has been offered to show that the existing rates are unjust, or that they operate to the prejudice of any of the Atlantic seaboard cities, will probably close the discussion of the subject for some time.

The Commissioners' report shows clearly that the complaints of unfairness in the existing system were not based on any examination or knowledge of the real nature of the system, but on an instinctive feeling that whatever the rates and differences were, they must be wrong. The Commissioners describe with a quiet humor "three distinct views" on the subject which were presented to them—the New York view, the Philadelphia view, and the Baltimore view—the New York view being that the differences in favor of Philadelphia and Baltimore are unjust; the Baltimore view being that differentials were right in principle, but too small; the Philadelphia view, that the differentials should continue, but that there ought to be no discrimination between Philadelphia and Baltimore. The supporters of each view had, of course, a theory of the business of transportation to back it up, one being that railroad rates ought to be proportioned to distance; another, that they ought to be determined by the cost of carriage; the third, that they should be regulated by competition—all beautiful illustrations of the ready uses to which a theory can be put when practical advantages are to be gained from it. The "distance principle" was supported by Philadelphia and Baltimore, since the practical effect of its adoption would be to increase greatly the differences in favor of those two cities. The Commissioners give a number of reasons why the distance principle will not work; the most obvious, perhaps, being that between roads serving the same city (e. g., the Erie, Central, and Pennsylvania in relation to New York) it could not be applied at all, for such roads, "irrespective of distance, must conform to the lowest rates." New York, on the other hand, is in favor of the cost principle; the "New York view" being that if this were applied, differentials would disappear altogether. But here the trouble was that the advocates of this view did not bring forward any evidence in support of it. Instead of proving their case by official reports or figures, they called the Commissioners' attention "to the topographical features of the country between New York and the head of Lake Michigan," and "its admirable facilities for the construction of railroads, which would be economical in original outlay, and economical also in their operation." The Commissioners think that it is impossible to predict how the application of the cost principle would work in practice, but as no "reliable information" on the subject seemed to be attainable, their conclusion that there is no certainty of its ap-

plication resulting in any benefit to New York seems safe and conservative.

The principle of competition, on the other hand, is the very principle that produces railroad wars, and all the troubles which lead to pooling arrangements and differential rates themselves. The Commissioners show very conclusively that competition for ocean freights must always tend to make differential rates a necessity. The competition between the trunk lines is chiefly in the products of the West—corn, wheat, etc.—which are exported to Europe. The price of these is fixed by the European demand, and they should net to the producer in the American market the foreign price less the charge for carrying and handling. The total charge for carrying to Europe by way of New York and Baltimore, for example, must be the same; and consequently, the ocean freight-rate from Baltimore being less than from New York, the inland rate must be greater. In this way competition itself tends to produce differential rates.

All this means, of course, that the railroads must in future, as in the past, fix the differentials themselves. The Commissioners do not pretend that the existing differentials may not become unjust. No previous compact has succeeded in controlling them permanently, and it is even possible that they may not now be right. But the Commissioners say that no evidence has been produced to show anything of the kind, and that therefore the matter must be left where it is, in the hands of the railroads. It must be said, however, that the very fact that there is no evidence shows a bad condition of administration. Each of the trunk lines and the community at large are interested in having evidence, and the Commissioners might have dwelt at greater length on this branch of the subject. They do indeed suggest that to enable the railroads "to judge fairly and with full understanding, accurate statistics of their business should be kept by each of them and submitted to the others or kept in some common office, and these statistics ought to be periodically given to the public also. Publicity is a great corrector of imaginary evils, and may be an important preventive of evils, both imaginary and real." They should be compelled to keep such statistics; and a report by a commission appointed to inquire into differential rates, that on most of the points involved no accurate evidence was attainable, should in future be impossible.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE FRENCH MAYOR.

In two articles recently printed in *L'Économiste Français*, M. Joseph Ferrand has given a very interesting account of the local governments of France, with especial reference to the powers of the mayors; and, as might have been expected, his inquiry clearly shows that in France, as in other countries, the problem of local government is still far from being solved in a satisfactory manner. But so far from there being the same difficulty that is very frequently met with in this country, of a mayor not clothed with power enough, M. Ferrand believes that the French mayor possesses too much of it, and that the true remedy lies in depriving him of some of it by

enlarging that of other officers, and in altering the manner of selecting the mayor. The mayor possesses greater personal powers, if we may so call them, in France than in any other country which pretends to have a well-adjusted system of local government; and this arises in part from the fact that he is the agent of a government which interferes to a large extent with the private as well as the public life of the citizen, with his industrial as well as with his political relations.

Thus he is charged with the registration of births, marriages, and deaths; he manages the property of the commune; he supervises all public works, the schools, charitable institutions, savings-banks, public manufactures, etc.; he appoints all his agents and prepares the estimate of the revenue and expenditure of the commune. These are all duties of a local character. But, in addition, the mayor is an agent of the central authority of the state, and as such is charged with the execution of public acts regarding elections, the recruiting of the Army, and national taxes. He is thus the representative of the Government in the commune, and also the representative of the commune itself.

By the law of 28 Pluviose, year viii., the mayor was appointed by the central authority or by its immediate agents the prefects, the chief officers of the departments. And to render the commune more subject to the central government, the members of the municipal councils, bodies formed to assist the mayors, were also named by the sovereign or by the prefects. This manner of appointing the mayor and council was continued until 1831, when the councils were made elective. But instead of following up this plan and decreasing the powers of the mayor, who remained a state officer, and increasing the powers of the municipal government, by which all that pertained to local matters would be regulated by them but administered by the mayor—a plan that would have educated the people in the management of their local affairs, and thus prepared them for higher political duties—instead of doing this, the powers of the council were limited, and the financial dependence of the communes, by which in many instances they were compelled to ask aid of the state for their daily expenses, was continued. It is only too apparent that the shadow and not the substance of local government, by which is meant self-government, is here.

The Second Empire, being virtually a one-man power, necessarily involved some changes in the local governments, by which they were rendered more subservient to the central government. But there were no essential changes, and save in the manner of choosing the mayor, deputy-mayors, and municipal council, the powers of the local government have remained almost unchanged, although the central government has passed through many phases of change, from a monarchy to a republic. In 1867 the powers of the council were enlarged, and since that time there has been by means of special legislation a continual tinkering with the local governments, which has produced a lack of uniformity in their organization and functions.

Thus in 1876 upwards of 33,000 communes,

out of a total of 36,000, nominated their own mayors and deputy-mayors (*adjoints*); and this power was given to those communes in which there was no agent of the central authority (save the mayor) and was denied to those places in which a prefect, sub-prefect, or justice of the peace was to be found. In short, in every chief town of the department the mayor is appointed by the central authority, and in every other commune by the prefect. In the former case they are generally, but not always, taken from the municipal council, which is, as we have said, an elective body. And, as showing how amenable to the central authority the communal government is, not only the mayor, but also the deputy-mayors, and even the municipal council, may be suspended by the prefect for two months; and the mayor and deputies may be dismissed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the municipal council may be suspended for one year by the same officer, and may be dissolved by a decree of the sovereign.

It is now proposed to make the mayor in all communes an elective officer, and this proposition is not regarded with any favor by M. Ferrand. The mayor, he says, in such a case, cannot exercise his twofold functions—that of representing the central authority and the commune—with anything like the energy he now possesses. Suppose, says M. Ferrand, the mayor is commanded by the sovereign to enforce in his commune an unpopular measure. Will he do this knowing that his position depends upon the good-will of the electors of the commune? Again, will a mayor forbear to use his personal powers and influences to defeat a candidate for the Conseil Général, or a Deputy, who may be opposed to him in politics? Will he, moreover, forbear to use his position and means to secure a reelection? These possible results seem to M. Ferrand to be fatal to the proposition, and if they did occur would destroy to that extent the efficiency of communal administration. In Italy the Cabinet of Cairoli-Depretis proposed in 1880 to make the syndic, or chief officer of the commune, elective, but at the same time measures were taken to preserve intact the interests of the state in these local divisions of the territory. And M. Ferrand thinks that somewhat the same course must be adopted in France, since any such change in the manner of selecting a mayor as is proposed would of necessity involve some changes in his functions. An elective mayor would be more of a communal than a state officer, and would therefore be less intimately connected with the central authority than at present. In fact, very much the same results would follow as have occurred in this State when the sheriffs, clerks of counties, and coroners, and other properly State officers, were made elective. The tendency is in France, as it is here, to regard a popular election as the best method of selecting officials; but it might easily be shown that the application of such elections is of very limited scope, especially with regard to executive offices, where a higher responsibility is obtained by appointment. The result of the proposal combatted by M. Ferrand will be watched with interest, for, if accepted, it will give a new

proof of the spread of republican ideas in France. But whether it will result in a better organized local administration, according to French notions, may be open to doubt.

THE ENGLISH POLICY IN EGYPT.

LONDON, July 11, 1882.

TO-DAY the English fleet is opening fire on the forts at Alexandria, an act whose consequences, now impossible to forecast, will have begun to make themselves felt before these lines reach you. As this is the point at which we have passed from discussion and diplomacy into the sphere of action, it is a good one for stopping to survey the steps by which we have been led up to an act likely to prove so momentous, and to describe the feelings and opinions with which the nation surveys the situation.

No question has arisen for a long time so full of complication as this; none in which there are so many factors to be considered—factors whose respective lines of conduct it is difficult to predict. In Egypt itself, although the army headed by Arabi Pasha is the dominant force, there are several other tendencies, and notably the religious sentiment of the people, to be dealt with. Then there is the Sultan, whose policy is so tortuous and vacillating that one cannot even explain it by supposing that he always intends the opposite of what he says. The four Powers, Germany, Austria, Russia, Italy, act to a certain extent together, yet with somewhat different objects in view; their collective action is the result sometimes of a determining impulse given by the most resolute, sometimes of a sort of compromise between the several volitions of each. France and England, as specially interested in Egypt, and as the Powers which have taken her ruler and her finances under their protection, form a group by themselves. Each professes, and to a certain extent feels, a wish to act in conjunction with the other. But their interests are not quite the same even in Egypt. Their respective positions in the general politics of Europe are of course quite different, as are the mental attitudes and constitutional habits both of their statesmen and of their peoples. I will attempt to sketch, so far as the materials yet published make it possible to do so, the line of policy which each seems to have sought to follow.

England has, or (to put it more exactly) is supposed to have, three interests in Egypt. The first is that of keeping the Suez Canal open and secure, affording a quiet and undisturbed passage for her troops, and still more for her mercantile vessels, from the Atlantic to the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The *quantum* of this interest is disputed, some holding that India and our Eastern trade would be in serious peril were the Canal stopped; others that this would merely entail a disagreeable but not formidable loss of time and money. However, it is admitted on all hands that the question of the Canal is a serious one for us. The second interest is that of our trade with Egypt, especially the export of cotton thence to England, and of our commercial colony established there. This consideration tells pretty strongly on people in Lancashire, some of whose towns depend for their cotton on the fine growths of the Delta; but if it stood alone, it would not be thought to justify intervention, because of course traders must take their chance, and can hardly expect military operations to be undertaken for their sake. The third is that of the English holders of Egyptian bonds. I mention it because it is frequently put forward by the non-interventionists as the origin of our present connection with Egypt, and a leading motive for keeping a hold on the country. But it has no real existence. There are,

of course, persons in England who, having invested in Egyptian securities, would like to see a Western Power compel the payment of the interest due to them, and coerce or govern Egypt for that purpose. But such persons are few; they would not venture to avow publicly their desire; they could not, even secretly, really affect the policy of the country. Practically the bondholding interest may be left out of the matter.

Almost more serious than these English interests in the country are the positive engagements under which England has come. Under Lord Beaconsfield's Government she joined with France in establishing the Financial Control, and she acted in procuring the deposition of Ismail Pasha and the elevation of Tewfik to be Khedive in his place. She has thus virtually assumed a species of protectorate, and become bound in honor to keep on the throne the candidate placed there with her participation. Her consuls have constantly advised the Khedive, and did so in the beginning of the very crisis which has brought about the present conflict. As Tewfik followed this advice, England seems bound to see him through the consequences. Moreover, she presented in May last an ultimatum demanding the retirement of Arabi and his leading associates. Its rejection was followed soon after by the attack on Europeans in Alexandria, in which many English subjects were killed or injured, and the Consul himself beaten. Finally, even had England wished to leave Egypt to itself, she could not have told that this might not have ended in allowing France to become supreme there, a result which would have been displeasing to the English people, and might have exposed the Suez Canal to a new danger. All these considerations appeared to the English Government to oblige them to take an active part in the settlement of the Egyptian difficulty. They set before themselves three objects: the maintenance of the present Khedive, the suppression of Arabi and the other mutinous military leaders, the protection of the Canal against the risks to which anarchy in Egypt would expose it. They had three dangers to avoid: the entering on such a military intervention as would compel them to occupy and hold Egypt, the breaking of their quasi-partnership with France, the giving offence to the other four European Powers and thereby causing the disruption of the European concert. The best way of avoiding these evils seemed to be to invoke the authority of the Sultan as Suzerain of Egypt, and accordingly he was invited, with the reluctant concurrence of France, to restore order, if possible by sending an envoy; if not, then by armed force. When the envoy, Dervish Pasha, failed to effect anything, and the Sultan, declaring that the crisis had terminated, but really fearing to appear the ally of infidels against good Mussulmans, refused to intervene with arms, a Conference was proposed as the best means of overcoming his unwillingness, and at the same time of associating the other Powers of Europe in the conduct and solution of the difficulty. This Conference, as you know, has sat for ten days or so, but as yet with no visible result. Throughout, the effort of the English Government has been to avoid isolated action, and obvious as were the objections to calling in the Turks, whom Mr. Gladstone and his followers have so often denounced, even these objections have been thought less than those applying to an occupation of Egypt by English and French troops. Even when the English fleet was despatched to Alexandria, its purpose was stated to be the protection of the lives and property of British subjects; and although this cannot be so well urged now, when all British subjects have left the country, the

bombardment just opened is announced to be not so much a coercive measure directed against the rebel soldiery as a defensive measure, rendered necessary by the continued erection of fortifications threatening the fleet. Nothing has been stated as to the landing of troops: the final solution of the problem is still being sought at Constantinople through action on the Sultan.

In both these last developments, the action at Alexandria and the negotiations at Constantinople, the often threatened divergence of ideas between England and France has at last declared itself. Of the policy of France I can give you only an English view, which may be as far from appreciating its real character as the French newspapers are from comprehending the grounds of the policy of England. France seems to us to have been governed by three motives. The first is the desire to keep abreast in every way of England, and allow England to gain no advantage which she does not share. (I need hardly add that she credits England with a far stronger disposition towards aggression than we conceive ourselves to be moved by.) The second is a prudent disposition to respect Mohammedan susceptibilities, to awaken no fresh burst of fanaticism, which might spread to Tunis and Algeria and renew the difficulties she has had to encounter there. And the third is an anxiety to avoid all sources of European dissension, especially such as might bring her into a collision with Germany, for which she is not at the moment prepared. Since the month of February (for under the brief rule of M. Gambetta a different and more ambitious line of conduct was pursued) the attitude of France has been very cautious and pacific. She has either criticised or demurred to most of the propositions England has advanced for joint action, has striven to avoid approaches to active intervention, and has been even more reluctant to appeal to the Sultan for aid in untying the knot. Her objection to his interference is doubtless due to the great hostility which the Turks have shown to France ever since the Tunisian expedition, which wounded their religious feelings as well as their claim, however empty, of supremacy over the states of North Africa. The Sultan did his utmost in an underhand way to stir up resistance to the French in Tunis; and any recovery by him of his authority in Egypt would doubtless be felt all along the south coast of the Mediterranean, and add fuel to the flame of Mohammedan irritation. France, therefore, under M. de Freycinet as well as under M. Gambetta, has been with difficulty induced to join in any appeal to the Sultan. Nothing but the apprehension that an English occupation of Egypt might be the alternative seems to have led her to acquiesce. And at the Conference which has invited the Sultan to interpose to restore order, the condition annexed by the French envoy is reported to have been that the Turks should enter the country purely as the mandatories of the six Powers, and not in virtue of the Sultan's paramount authority—a condition to which the latter is not likely to assent.

How far public opinion in France approves the conduct of its Government it is not easy to learn; but apparently no other course is strongly pressed by any section except that which follows M. Gambetta. Then in England the tendencies are much the same as those I endeavored to describe to you three weeks or a month ago. The mass of the nation doesn't understand the question, and knows that it doesn't. It is therefore disposed to believe that Mr. Gladstone, who has never before been accused of an ambitious, aggressive, warlike policy, but rather of being too humble and undecided, must have yielded to nothing less than necessity when he ordered so strong a step as the bombardment of the forts at

Alexandria. The idea that the Canal is endangered comes in to reinforce this confidence. Among the Tory leaders, no accusation, except that of not having acted with sufficient energy in the earlier stages of the crisis, has yet been formulated; but when the time for debate comes, weak points will, of course, be discovered. There is, to be sure, a section of the Liberal party which declares we have no business in Egypt at all, and protests against the acts of to-day. But this party is not strong in the country, and in Parliament could probably muster no more than a dozen votes. On the whole, it seems as if the Government was carrying the general feeling of the people along with it; and if the operations of to-day turn out well, the Government may even gain credit for its vigorous action. Y.

THE COMING ELECTIONS FOR THE PRUSSIAN LANDTAG.

BERLIN, July 1, 1882.

SINCE the defeat of the tobacco monopoly, chaos rules in our political circles. Nobody can answer the question, What is to come next? Such an overwhelming overthrow of Bismarck's pet measure was not anticipated even by the most sanguine: it is his Moscow. Think of a House with a Conservative majority, and on the day of the vote numbering 332 members present, of whom only 43 voted with the Government, and you can easily imagine that the result created a deep sensation even among Bismarck's minions. It is true, he has experienced some heavier defeats: not a single man rose for the attempted restriction of freedom of speech in the Reichstag; only two votes were given for the military law which was designed to exempt the richer classes from serving in the Army in certain cases; and the plan of voting the budget once in every two years instead of annually found no support at all. These bills, however, were mere trial-balloons: they came and disappeared the same day; but the tobacco monopoly was prepared for four years with all the Chancellor's energy and obstinacy. Great folios were filled with the examination of witnesses, mountains of opinions were amassed, commissions of experts were called, an exploded French institution (the "Conseil Supérieur") was instituted, and a "Volkswirtschaftsrath" introduced into Prussia to further the monopoly, and two Ministers of Finance were sacrificed to the great idol—Camphausen at the beginning and Bitter at the end. God have mercy on their souls, they will never be resuscitated!

The wounds, however, which have been inflicted on our industry and commerce, as well as on the national prosperity, will not so easily be healed. Four years of strife, full of anxiety and fear, of hope and low spirits, have been in vain. How much unlucky speculation was stirred up, how much healthy activity was intimidated! Three, if not four, times our poor manufacturers and tobacco merchants had to change the basis of their operations. Some purchased large quantities of tobacco in advance; others confined themselves to the lowest limit of supply; one extended his business, as he expected to realize profits from the monopoly, while another, for the opposite reason, did not dare to lay in a large stock of the splendid crop of 1881. Instead of devoting themselves to their legitimate calling, and pushing their regular business, thousands of merchants for the last four years could think of nothing else than how to evade the threatening disaster. The lobby of the Reichstag was beset by parties interested in the tobacco trade. There was no end of letter-writing, meetings, travelling, inquiring, and counselling. Shall we or shall we not accept the monopoly? Shall we side with Bismarck in order to get heavy dam-

ages, or shall we offer resistance? Shall we beseech or defy the Government? Every shop, every office, became a convective of debating politicians. The Chamber of Commerce of a large city wanted the advice of a prominent Deputy. "What can I tell you?" he answered. "You had better inquire at Rome." But this time the Pope and his satellites held back, and the Centre voted with the Opposition against the monopoly, as Bismarck had not been found pliant and yielding enough in relation to the Falk laws. If a statistical table could be made of all the extravagance and waste of capital, energy, and strength which this unfortunate monopoly has wrought throughout Germany, one would be amazed at the enormous sums unprofitably thrown away. But worse than that, the true economic perception, that only the quiet and undisturbed day's and night's industry and steadiness of devoted and cheerful labor make house and grange flourish, has nearly been extinguished by Bismarck's home policy. Instead of meditating how to improve their factories and shops, or how to perfect their method of buying and selling all the year round, some puzzle their brains how to avail themselves of the favor of the law, and others again how they may best avert its disadvantages. Politics has been withdrawn from politics, and has penetrated places where it does not belong. And still "Catheder-Socialists" like A. Schäffle and A. Wagner, who some years ago seriously proposed that the large cities should buy all the dwelling and tenement-houses within their limits, in order to accommodate the poor workingmen, are still the Chancellor's trusted advisers, and his teachers in political economy.

How can this sad state of affairs be changed? There is only one alternative. In other really constitutional countries a ministry having suffered such an ignominious defeat would resign, and make room for a successor who agreed with the large majority of the people. Bismarck, of course, is far from indulging in such "sentimental whims." He holds the power and will hold it to the end. The other day he likened himself to Robert Bruce and the spider. In fact, he will not yield, nor will he dissolve the present Reichstag and appeal to the people, because he very well knows that his schemes are detested by the people. He must, therefore, be again defeated, and to that end a Liberal majority be elected for the German Reichstag as well as for the Prussian Landtag. This chance is not only possible, but the more likely as the Chancellor is again on the road to the worst kind of demagogism. In the last year's elections he claimed the proceeds of the tobacco monopoly as the "patrimony of the disinherited," and at the last debate in the Reichstag he gave the shibboleth for the next Landtag's election in the words, "Away with the sheriff" (executor), which was, is, and will be repeated over and over again by the governmental press. This bugbear of the sheriff is to frighten the people into granting new indirect, and to discredit the payment and levy of old direct, taxes. The sheriff, of course, in no country in the world is a popular man, but his office cannot be abolished as long as there are people unwilling or unable to contribute their share toward the expenses of the Government. On the other hand, the large mass of the people are not so stupid or incapable of judgment as the Chancellor supposes; besides, the poorer classes, with a yearly income of less than \$80 marks, pay nothing, and thus do not make the personal acquaintance of the sheriff. Per contra, the poorer and middle classes, if they did not know it before, now very well appreciate the fact that indirect taxes laid on the necessities of life are much more oppressive and fall heavier on them than on the well-to-do.

I will not dwell here on the exaggerated state-

ments of the Chancellor and his organs about the number of seizures and forced sales. For the sake of impressing the popular mind, the amount of several years is summed up, in order to make it appear higher; and the different stages, from the notice and warning down to a real seizure, are taken as so many separate acts, while in fact they constitute only one. The papers are full of instances and proofs opposed to the above partial statements, and thus reduce the latter to their real insignificance. I therefore believe that this manoeuvre will not succeed. I very well understand how a Socialist who wishes to make capital for his ideas will act practically by abusing the sheriff or exposing him to public attacks, but I do not understand how a minister in such an authoritative and conspicuous position as the powerful Chancellor can muster the courage officially to denounce the daily-increasing misery of executions, "loudly crying to heaven," and thus to sap the foundations of that same frame of government which he above all others is bound to strengthen and protect. What inference will the uneducated draw from such passionate appeals to ignorance and prejudice? Of course, that it will be best to pay no taxes at all, and if possible to chase away the sheriff. In my opinion, it is sawing off the branch of the tree on which the Government sits to stir up the dislike of the taxpayers to the levy of taxes.

And yet the reform of the taxes is Bismarck's chief object. How he will effect it he has not yet made public. The country wants a well-digested plan, but he only answers with big promises and general phrases, saying that the Government must prove to the working classes by facts that they, too, are entitled to its protection. But which of his favorite measures will immediately be carried out we do not learn, and I believe the Chancellor does not yet know himself. This much, however, is certain, that he wants more money than has hitherto been anticipated, and that at least some 200 or 300 millions of marks per year will for the present be required. Now, no Liberal will vote for any new taxes until those on the necessities of life have first been abolished; moreover, he wants to know beforehand how the new taxes will be spent. We are in no hurry for a reform, and can wait; all the necessary governmental expenses have been provided for, and of new socialistic experiments there is no need. The other day I found an article in one of the official papers which is too significant not to be mentioned. Mr. Bitter, to whom I have alluded above, had to resign his secretaryship of the Prussian treasury because he did not effectually assist the Chancellor in his tobacco campaign. This gentleman is of a very subordinate stamp, and it is a settled fact that his successor will not excel him. "Our last three ministers of finance," the paper said, "have in managing the finances committed the great mistake of not keeping the higher interests of the Government in view, or, in other words, of considering their office as an end in itself. Instead of subordinating it to the high political and social tasks of the state, they have placed themselves in brusque contradiction to these, and withheld the means necessary to remove existing evils and to solve new problems required by the wants of society." These words, if they have any sense at all, evidently mean that a sound financial policy is not to be based on financial principles, but must serve the interests and views of the almighty Chancellor; they are evidently published with a single eye to the impending elections. In keeping with this opinion, the public is informed that Prince Bismarck will temporarily charge himself with the management of the finances, so that although not residing in Berlin, besides being Chancellor of the Empire, he will be Prussian Minister of Foreign

Affairs, as well as of Commerce and of the Treasury. A subservient tool doing the daily routine business will finally be found.

This time it evidently is Mr. Scholz, a young aspiring officer (*Streber*), who has hitherto been Assistant Secretary of State in the Imperial Treasury. It is a pity that the higher dignitaries of state have so far deteriorated that instead of feeling themselves Bismarck's coördinates, they act on command, and strictly follow the many changes which their self-constituted chief is in the habit of undergoing. When he justifies a new and sudden change of opinion by declaring that his foreign policy had prevented him from studying a question raised by himself, sober and earnest men will answer him, and have already done so, that he ought to have left the management of home affairs to other less occupied and more experienced hands. The creatures, however, who have been reared and elevated by him find their chief's excuses quite natural, if not grand, and they adore to-day what they yesterday burned, and burn to-day what they adored yesterday. After having been used for a while they are mercilessly thrown aside like squeezed oranges, and replaced by others who are, if possible, still less stable. When he suffers a well-merited defeat, Bismarck bitterly complains of the small animosities of the political factions, which subordinate patriotism to petty party interests. "No faction," he says, "is strong enough to support the Government," a sentence which translated into the affirmative means that the Government would most cheerfully avail itself of the services of a party if it were strong enough and submitted to Bismarck's discretion. "If the Administration," he continues, "should accept the support of a party, it would become dependent on the politicians, and be bound to make concessions to or reward the leaders, in order to keep them on its side." This reasoning is wrong—at least not justified in our political history; for as long as Bismarck (from 1867 to 1876) had a liberal policy, the Liberals followed him without making any conditions at all, and identified their course of action with his. Thus it happened that the Ministers were taken from the Conservative side, while, with the assistance of the Liberals, old reactionary laws were repealed and new progressive ones passed. Never has a statesman been in such a favorable condition. But those times have passed. The Liberals of all shades are now unanimously of opinion that Bismarck's influence must be broken, and I believe that if it be not broken, it will at least be paralyzed, and that legislation will come to a standstill. The next election to the Prussian Landtag will prove the correctness of my view: the Conservatives, divided among themselves, and jealous of each other, will be badly beaten.

+++

PONTMARTIN'S MEMOIRS.

PARIS, June 22.

It is always interesting to read conscientious recollections even of an ordinary man. Reality is all we ought to care about; any real life, humble as it may have been, has its lessons, its touching or dramatic episodes. M. Armand de Pontmartin is not much known out of France; he has even in France but a limited reputation. He has always been on the outskirts of literature: he has written feuilletons, dramatic or other, and a few novels, which have not made him popular. But he has lived in interesting times, and has known interesting men. He gives us now his 'Mémoires' at the same moment that M. Maxime Du Camp does. He remarks modestly that in old times the writers of Mémoires were generals, statesmen, leaders of

men; but that in the eighteenth century it became the fashion for the literary men—for Mar-montel, for Rousseau, and others—to show themselves like actors before the public. After all, these philosophers, these academicians in the midst of the breaking up of an age of long-established institutions, represented a new force, still invisible, but already very powerful. They were becoming more important than negotiators, than diplomats, than ministers, than generals, as they were to furnish new ideas to a new civilization. M. de Pontmartin has no such high pretensions; he has been a spectator lost in a crowd, and merely wishes to say what he has seen.

He was born in the south, in a village which lies between Nîmes and Avignon; he remembers the journey of Madame Duchess of Angoulême in the south of France, and the mission of the "Fathers of the Faith" to Avignon. The Mayor, a peasant, begged him to make an address to Madame. The young man was eighteen years old; Chateaubriand was his idol; his family was loyal. He prepared a short address; but, alas! Madame did not stop. Her carriages passed like a vision, and when the peasants were ready to scream "Vive Madame!" all was gone. It was, he says, his first lesson in political philosophy. The mission of Avignon in 1819 has remained legendary in the south. From all parts of the south the peasants came to hear the sermons of the Fathers: Royalists and Bonapartists were equally fervent. It was what is called in America a revival. Old usurers returned money which they had received for years.

Pontmartin made brilliant studies in Paris; he won the first prize at the *concours général*, and dined, on this occasion, at the table of the Minister of Public Instruction, M. de Vatissémnil, with Alfred de Musset, who had taken the second prize in philosophy. What a philosopher! The young poet, then seventeen years old, wrote a ponderous essay in Latin: "Quibus libet vitæ in temporibus, quibuscumque incubat disciplinis homo," etc. There were six pages like that. We naturally must choose in the memoirs of Pontmartin what concerns the bigger stars of the Romantic sky:

"One forms generally," he observes, "a wrong idea of the literary situation of M. Victor Hugo during the last two years of the Restoration. At a distance it is natural to see everything in masses, and now, at this distance of more than a half-century, one can easily believe that the poet of the 'Orientales,' who was soon to be the author of 'Hernani,' had on his side all the studios, all the partisans of progress, all the students, all the lettered and liberal youth, and had against him all the old, the traditional men, the remnants of the literature of the Empire, those who were called the Classics, the *perruques*, the *momies*. It was not so. The public of M. Victor Hugo was already very enthusiastic, but was very restricted. It was a staff: it was not an army. Out of ten of my comrades, there were at least eight who persisted in preferring to him Casimir Delavigne; and, as for placing him on the same line with Lamartine, such an idea did not occur to anybody."

Pontmartin was one of the "staff" of Victor Hugo. He was angry when one of his fellow-students, meeting him in the garden of the Luxembourg or under the galleries of the Odéon, affected to cite some verse of the 'Orientales' with an ironical sneer—

"Tantôt d'une eau dormante il lève son corps bleu";
or,
"Un homme alors passait, couvert d'un caftan vert";
or,
"Elle aimait trop le bal, c'est ce qui l'a tuée."

We have forgotten now the sensation produced by this sort of versification; the poet has completely thrown it into the shade. Pontmartin was already on the side of the poet; he was a strong royalist, and Hugo also was then a royalist. The monarchical papers defended him; he

was constantly attacked and ridiculed by the Liberals of the *Journal des Débats*, of the *Constitutionnel*, and of the *National*. The Romantics were enthusiastic for the Middle Ages, for Christian art, for Gothic cathedrals; they professed to despise Greek temples, the neo-paganism of the eighteenth century, and the philosophical movement. The Classics laughed heartily when Hugo wrote such verses as these in his "Pluie d'Été":

"Le petit ruisseau de la plaine,
Pour une heure enflé, roule et traîne
Brins d'herbe, lézards endormis;
Court, et précipitant son onde
Du haut d'un caillou qu'il inonde,
Fait des Niagaras aux fourmis!"

Even Pontmartin seems to have found it difficult to defend these small Niagaras.

The literary discussions often took place in the reading-rooms (*cabinets de lecture*) of Madame Cardinal. I knew the last of these reading-rooms, which disappeared one by one. They were a feature of old Paris. There was always a lady who gave out the books and papers, and was on familiar and friendly terms with her clients—young men who could not afford to buy the books they wished to read, old pensioned officers and employees. The Célimène of the circulating library was amiable to all; she had political as well as literary opinions; from her throne she passed judgment on men and things. Her name was often Malvina. Her life was a mystery; what became of her when the last lamp with the green shade was extinguished nobody knew. The Malvina of the time of 1829 and 1830 knew Victor Hugo, and Sainte-Beuve, and Alfred de Musset, Charles Nodier, Émile and Antony Deschamps, Devéria the painter, Bocage, Lizier, Beauvallet, Lockroy, actors of the Odéon; Laboulaye (then completely unknown); Nisard, Camille Doucet, now members of the French Academy.

On the 25th of February, 1880, Paul Huet, who made a reputation as a landscape painter, came to Pontmartin and asked him, "'Will you go to the first representation of 'Hernani'?' 'Will I go?' said I; 'ask the youth thirsting for love if he wishes *Juliet* to throw him the silken ladder; ask the hungry poet if he wishes Chevet to offer him *gratis* a dinner in three courses; ask the *figurant* of the *Ambigu* if he wishes to make his début at the French Theatre.' 'Well, I will have a ticket for you; but I tell you that it will be hard.' 'Hard verses? Then it will not be Hugo?' 'Yes, Hugo, and of the best.'" It was necessary to enter the theatre at two o'clock in the afternoon, and to wait for the representation without a dinner. Youth is a good thing, and enthusiasm well fills the place of a dinner. The tickets were distributed at Victor Hugo's house. He signed on each the name "Hiero," which also appears on the original edition of "Hernani." Pontmartin tells us that there were about four hundred young men who received such tickets; among them were the painter Louis Boulanger, Émile Deschamps the poet, Charles Nodier, Devéria, Montalivet. The next day, a long queue was formed early before the theatre. Théophile Gautier was conspicuous in it by his long, flowing hair and his red waistcoat. For six hours the Romantics waited at a little door opening on the Rue Montpensier. Pontmartin tells us that the enthusiasm of all these young men had an interested object: they all wished to influence Hugo by their devotion, and to take him over to the Liberal cause.

He gives a very graphic account of the famous representation of "Hernani." In the pit were all the Romantics; in the boxes were the Classics: it seemed to be the battle of two worlds, of two different ideals. Pontmartin says very candidly that the first representation of "Hernani" created more stupor than admiration, even among the Romantics. Some of the latter

were completely upset by certain faults of taste, ponderous pleantries, puns like

"Le jeune amant sans barbe à la barbe du vieux."

A young Romantic was heard to exclaim: "Ma foi, j'aime mieux Racine!" The fifth act, fortunately, the finest dramatic work of Hugo, carried the public away. Mlle. Mars, though she was a Classic, somewhat hostile to the new poet, was conscientious, and she surpassed herself in the famous scene of the death of *Doña Sol*. The next day, the press attacked Hugo with the greatest severity. Every representation became a battle. Mlle. Mars became tired of these terrible scenes, and finally "Hernani" disappeared from the stage, and was not played again till a long time afterward.

Alexandre Dumas (the father) was only twenty-seven years old at this time. Pontmartin was invited to hear him read a drama, with Decamps, Tony Johannot, Paul Huet, Alfred de Vigny, and a few others. This singular man, with his mulatto complexion, his sensual face, prided himself in his old age on having written 1,200 volumes, which could all be read by a workingman of the Faubourg St. Antoine and by the girls of the Faubourg St. Germain. He was a great child, a marvellous story-teller. Dumas began life as a clerk in the bureaux of the Palais Royal. He owed much to Louis Philippe, and he was afterward patronized by his sons. In his memoirs he speaks as if he all alone had made the Revolution of 1830. To be sure, he afterward made the Revolution of 1848. He made the conquest of Sicily with Garibaldi—or thought that he did; at any rate, he took possession of one of the royal palaces of the King of the Two Sicilies, and the Italians found it difficult to turn him out.

Pontmartin gives interesting details of Ozanam, the Christian philosopher, whom he chose, in a great crisis, as his religious and intellectual director. Ozanam is nearly forgotten; he has had his day. He was a philanthropist, hoping to reconcile the poor and the rich, to bring all men together in a Christian spirit. He had the heart of a priest, the eloquence of an apostle. He was fully aware of the terrible dangers of the social question. Pontmartin becomes very eloquent when he speaks of the influence of Chateaubriand on the youth of the Restoration. He maintains that Chateaubriand did more than anybody else to mould the minds of the generations who came forward at the end of the French Empire and before Louis Philippe—more than Lamartine, more than Musset did after him. He reconciled religion and royalism with liberalism; he opened new horizons in every field of thought; he was the personification of all that was noble in old France, of all that was coming to light in the new France.

M. de Pontmartin has only given in this first volume the recollections of his childhood and of his youth. His style is lively, his sincerity is evident. We hope that he will continue the publication of these memoirs. There is much space still before him—the whole reign of Louis Philippe, the Revolution of 1848, the Second Empire, and the Republic of to-day.

GARIBALDI AND MAZZINI.

GENOA, June 29, 1882.

GARIBALDI is left literally alone in his glory, there in the weird, wild, desolate Caprera, which he loved with an intensity inexplicable to all save those who had caught the half-poetic, half-savage side of his singular character. I remember when, in 1855, with some other English friends, we accompanied him on a shooting tour over the island of Sardinia, what wistful eyes he cast from the shores of the Maddalena to

what appeared a mere barren rock in the ocean; how he detested the ovations of the Sardinians, in whom, however, he instilled his then newly-born faith in the King of Sardinia as the future champion of Italy. During the month we spent at Sassari, Macomer, and Cagliari, he lived literally gun in hand, flaying his meat on the fires kindled of myrtle and cistus, rising at dawn, going "to roost with the chickens," as his hosts remarked; polite to all, but interested in nothing save the slaughter of wild boars, foxes, hares, partridges—whatever came to gun. He and his faithful Basso were the best sportsmen known, never missing a bird in the air or a fish rising from the sea. "If ever I can put together 1,000 francs," he said, as we returned, "Caprera shall be mine, and I shall invite you, who have not many wants, to come and rough it with me." Next year we received a letter announcing the death of his brother Felix, who had left him 25,000 francs.

On the island of Caprera at that time the Englishman Collins possessed a small portion; the remainder was state property, and Garibaldi bought it in, lot by lot, coming over to England to purchase a cutter for the transport of building material from Genoa to the desolate island. Menotti, Basso, and a couple of humble comrades, living with him under a tent, first built the rough log house, then the modest white house, where, even as late as 1867, when I went over to arrange his flight after the Government had imprisoned him in Alessandria and blockaded the island, the same preadamitic simplicity prevailed. Later some English friends presented him with the yet unpurchased portions of the island, and, under the régime of his second peasant wife, comforts and even luxury were gradually introduced. But Garibaldi never changed his habits or his predilections, and so intense was his desire that his ashes should remain at Caprera, that he had ordered his wife to burn his remains before announcing his death even to the other members of the family. This, and this only, is true, as I wrote in my last letter; nor until I could see the various members of the family would I give heed to any of the different versions of the reasons for disobedience. Last week Dr. Prandina, and yesterday the family, left Caprera, and from their various testimony results the fact that Garibaldi's last behest has not been wilfully disobeyed, and that "Quod differtur non aufertur." Garibaldi willed to be burnt in true pagan-Indian Shelley fashion, not cremated in modern "civilized" style. Dr. Prandina, to whom he entrusted the execution of this his express desire, is one of the most enthusiastic champions of cremation, and is a member of the Milanese society which, for the payment of a certain sum during life, engages to cremate any one who shall so ordain in his will. In the grand monumental cemetery at Milan there are two crematories, one erected by Keller, on the Gorini system, and presented to the municipality of Milan on the express condition that his body should be the first cremated, and the "Poma" crematory, a much more complicated affair. In the former, where, on the average, two corpses are cremated per week, the body is immersed in a solution heated to a high temperature, the chemical composition of which is known only to a few, passed into the furnace, where it remains two hours, and where, by the arrangement of a quantity of earthenware balls to which the soot clings, all offensive odor is destroyed. At the expiration of the second hour the body is removed to a sort of annealing-room, where the bones in another hour crumble to the finest dust, and, placed in an urn, can be removed by the friends of the deceased or deposited in a sort of *cenerario* built for the purpose. As only wood is used in the burning, the

process is inexpensive: the payment of 32 francs insures the right of cremation in the Keller crematory, Gorini system, at Milan. Well, all this Dr. Prandina explained to Garibaldi when the latter first broached his intentions. Garibaldi listened attentively, says Dr. Prandina, one of our old volunteer surgeons, whose word can be implicitly relied on, and then said: "No! I won't be baked in an oven like a fowl. When I am dead, do you lay me on that little iron bed, and the bed on the pyre which I shall have prepared; dress me in my red shirt, leave my face uncovered, and turn my face to the east." Prandina objected that the tremendous wind-blasts of Caprera would disperse the ashes in great part. "No matter; you can secure a handful to put in an urn between the tombs of Rosa and Anita." "But," still urged Prandina, "they will not even be all your ashes, but be mixed with the wood of the pyre." "*Tanto meglio*," quoth the General; "the pyre will be made of the trees and bushes that I love—I planted them all myself."

In January, 1882, when Garibaldi was at Naples, Prandina, who had ever felt most uncomfortable at the idea of the responsibility, went again to him and said: "General, should we be so unfortunate as to lose you on the Continent, am I then to cremate you at Milan?" "Certainly not; you will hire a hack and take me back to Caprera, and there do with my remains exactly as I told you!" Just a month after the General's return home he died. I mistook the date of the departure of his own doctors, which took place at the commencement, and not at the end of May. He had taken next to no food for twelve days, but the only doctor there, an inexperienced youth, said there was no danger. But Garibaldi knew that he was dying, and on the very eve of his death insisted on having a bath. His last visit had been to the crematory, where he had seen the wood stacked on the old millstones. But when actually dead, and the widow, with only Menotti, just arrived, was there, it was natural they should await the rest of the family, who, summoned, arrived too late. And meanwhile the fatal news had spread also—the instructions for the burning of the body, which Prandina, on starting for Caprera, had left with the Prefect of Genoa to be transmitted to the Government.

Within the first three days 12,000 telegrams reached the family, the majority imploring Menotti to have the body embalmed; and meanwhile it was clearly proved that the wood stacked, and all the aromatic and resinous wood existing in Caprera, would not suffice, in twenty-four hours in the open air, to consume the precious relics. Then, very naturally, a sudden horror seized on all. Even those who had gone, full of poetic reverence for the idea, including Alberto Mario, who nurtured the hope that the heart, like Shelley's, might be preserved for Rome, protested that they would leave the island immediately rather than see the corpse desecrated. The Prefect of Sassari declared formally that open-air burning was illegal. The Government sent doctors and surgeons, with materials for building a crematory, and Dr. Pini of Milan accompanied them. But he does not possess the secret of the chemical solution. Moreover, the General's objection to being baked like a fowl was brought forward. Hence the body was embalmed, placed in three coffins of zinc, chestnut, and walnut, and the official ceremony (present, Prince Thomas of Genoa, representative of King Humbert and brother to Queen Margaret) over, it was decided to bury the coffin between the two children, Rosa and Anita. A granite rock protruding, this was found impossible, so a grave was built hastily of brick, and the body deposited there. When the

representatives of King, Senate, Chambers, municipalities, and every association in Italy, besides thousands of individuals who thronged there on their own account—all weather-bound for twenty-four hours—had finally quitted Caprera, the family, fearing the damp, had the body removed, and the sepulchre lined with hydraulic cement. Then the body was replaced, and five successive granite slabs brought to cover the tomb. All broke on being placed thereon. Finally, all the male members of the family, aided by some robust fishermen from the Maddalena and the sailors of the *Cariddi* (Government frigate), rolled down a massive block of granite weighing four tons, on which the single word "Garibaldi" was roughly hewn.

So the sepulchre is sealed and guarded by twenty-five soldiers of the line, and, more jealously still, by the inhabitants of the Maddalena, who, with the half-savage population of Sardinia, are resolved that the General shall be obeyed at least in this, that the remains shall not be removed from Caprera. The family, meanwhile, saddened and bewildered by conflicting duties, have left the final decision to the National Assembly; and, despite the first strong current in favor of obedience, in letter and in spirit, to Garibaldi's last behest, it is more than probable that they will decree that he be burnt at Caprera, and the ashes transported to the Janiculum. Political reasons for this decision may bias many: the idea of Garibaldi, from the heights of the Janiculum, whence, in 1849, he defied and defeated the foreign champions of the Pope, still from his urn menacing the Vatican and the Quirinal, is naturally an attractive one to the ever increasing Republican party. But there are two material reasons which have weight with all who loved and revered the General without regard to party or to creed. In the first place, a very justifiable fear of body-snatchers prevails. At present the body is, and the ashes would be, strictly guarded; but time dims enthusiasm and dulls vigilance, and a band of adventurous scoundrels might at least attempt a seizure. Secondly, after the letter to Prandina, Garibaldi, yielding to the entreaties of his peasant wife (wife not yet at that time), provided that her ashes should be mingled with his own. Naturally, the first family, whose mother, the brave, unfortunate Anita, lies alone in the cemetery of Nice, on foreign soil, would object to this; nor would the nation in general care to make a pilgrimage to the shrine of La Francesca. So, for one reason and another, and all piled together, much time will not elapse before we shall see a monument covering the remains or ashes of Garibaldi on the tallest heights within the walls of Rome.

Assuredly, never in any time or country has the death of one man excited such universal, spontaneous, passionate grief. Truly, he had "the genius to be worshipped" in his life, and now all strive in their own fashion to prolong that worship to the inanimate clay. Another, who had only the genius to be loved, and who till now has never had the justice to be honored in his grave, divided with Garibaldi the public feeling and attention of this sad month of June. But for the catastrophe of the 2d, the inauguration of the monument to Mazzini in his native Genoa on the 22d of June, the anniversary of his birthday, would have brought together all the rank and file of the Italian democracy. As it was, the ceremony was most impressive—pathetic, even solemn. All signs of festivity or of rejoicing were suppressed—no illuminations, no fireworks, no banquets, no pleasure-trips; but 500 banners, representing the thought and action of Italy, veiled in black, surrounded the base, and thousands of Italians gazed, many with tearful eyes, on the marble image of the great

Genoese, whom Swinburne so aptly coupled with Columbus in his "Song of Italy":

"One found a new world 'mid the virgin sea,
And one found Italy."

I send you the original poem written by Swinburne for the occasion.

The monument unveiled, all the workingmen's associations met for serious discussion of their interests and political programme; then, on the morrow, all marched up to the cemetery of Staglieno, which rises on the lowest spur of the Apennines, and where Mazzini (alas! embalmed) looks out on his mother's tomb beneath the cypresses. Each veiled flag bent in salutation; then the huge procession dispersed, and the silence remained unbroken. The city is still tapestried with texts from his works, and one may truly say: "He being dead yet speaketh."

Correspondence.

HEREDITY OF JOSEPH STICKNEY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of July 13 you confound Charles W. Stickney, the Harvard graduate, who committed a homicide in Colorado, and who was acquitted on the ground of insanity, with Joseph Stickney, ex-vice-president of a New York coal company, ex-superintendent of a Wilkesbarre, Pa., coal-mine, and wholesale dealer in coal at No. 7 Cortlandt Street, New York City, of whose 254 immediate ascendants I found 174, and wrote short biographies in the July number of the *Granite Monthly* of Concord, where he is one of the largest real-estate owners.

As none of Joseph's ascendants are known to have been insane, or to have died of consumption, or to have been divorced, and only two to have drunk to excess, you say that, "on the Guiteau theory of defence, his case [meaning that of Charles W.] is one which clearly calls for hanging." It is also true of Joseph's ascendants that there were only six marriages of cousins—one each of first, second, third, and tenth cousins, and two of fifth cousins. Among the thirty-two couples that constitute the sixth generation were representatives from over eighteen different counties in England, besides those from Scotland and Ireland, showing few marriages of identity or proximity of birthplaces. In New England there were many such marriages, as they lived in four counties—Essex, Mass., and Rockingham, Hillsboro, and Merrimack, N. H.

Undoubtedly the ascendants of Joseph Stickney differed greatly in these respects from those of Charles W. Stickney and Charles J. Guiteau. Among the ascendants of Charles W. were families by the names of Kehew, Dow, Jackman, Pidgeon, Burrill, Poor, and Morse—respectable names, probably, but such as do not prejudice us so much in favor of their owners as those of Gilman, Starbuck, Shapleigh, Coffin, Ward, Dudley, Woodbridge, Parker, Goldstone, Bright, Audley, Peabody, Dane, Osgood, Jewett, Denton, Carleton, Peaslee, and Andrew—the names of Joseph's ancestors.

Dr. George M. Beard, a student of heredity, who patriotically and heroically tried to save the country from the disgrace of hanging an insane man, will yet show, I trust, that the ascendants of the insane and criminals differ so radically from those of morally, mentally, and physically healthy men that black and white men can be no more easily distinguished from each other than they.

Among the offences of Joseph's ascendants whose "heinousness cannot be accurately judged," are the cases of Mrs. Mary (Clements) Osgood and Mrs. Deliverance (Hazeltine) Dane, of

Andover, who, in 1692, were supposed for a brief time to be witches. Surely there is something in heredity, for in 1882 their descendant, Joseph Stickney, of New York City, for a brief time was supposed to be a murderer.

WALTER GIBSON.

CONCORD, N. H.

[We must apologize to the rightful bearer of the name for the lapse of memory on our part.—ED. NATION.]

THE REGULARS AND THE NEW SCHOOL. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Since you have been reproached by so many of your constant readers for the article on "Doctor and Patient" in your penultimate number, it may be balm to your wounds, even at this late day, to be assured that there are other readers, equally constant, who rejoice that you have touched upon subjects the fair discussion of which is persistently excluded from "regular" medical journals. An opportunity is now afforded, I trust, to discuss the questions of dogma and science, to which the whole quarrel between regularity and irregularity may be reduced, and I only regret that any delay should have occurred in offering such explanations as much in the spirit and letter of your "regular" correspondents demands.

Without attempting to answer any of their propositions directly, allow me to state the position of the homeopaths in as few words as the subject will permit.

They are said to be quacks for adhering more or less strictly to a therapeutic principle or law. If their adhesion is strict, they are called fools; if lax, "knaves," with all its variations, is the word; and under all circumstances, whether the cases may be those in which the question of administering drugs is uppermost or not, their patients are denied the comfort of a consultation with members of the dominant school, who declare that no general law expressing the relation of drugs to morbid conditions can exist.

Even if the homeopaths held that any one theory could explain the action of all remedies in all diseases, and that their principle were such a theory, they would not, in view of the extreme uncertainty of all matters pertaining to therapeutics, deserve all the opprobrium their enemies seek to cast upon them, absurd as such a proposition would be. But the fact is, that the great majority do now, as they have done from the beginning, refuse to admit that their law partakes in any sense of the nature of a theory, dogma, or article of belief. They claim for it no other attributes than belong to any physiological principle which formulates the recurrence of certain phenomena under certain conditions.

A very large proportion, if not the majority, of "laws" governing, as we say, the course of vital phenomena, are principles of this kind, as I need hardly remind you, and they vary in the certainty of their operation according to the degree of exactness with which the conditions necessary for their manifestation can be supplied. Unless due allowance is made, however, for habits of speech, it is wrong to say of them that they "govern" phenomena, or are operative in producing effects, as they are, I repeat, no more than observed uniformities or formulae expressing the more or less regular occurrence of events under given conditions. The equality in the number of male and female births, taking the year together; the increase in the number of suicides at certain seasons; the fact that substances containing nitrogen in very high proportion are powerful poisons, are laws of this kind, as are many of the laws of heredity, the law of chemical affinity, and innumerable others, which

will readily suggest themselves to the professional as well as the unprofessional mind. They are not theories or dogmas; neither are they laws of nature in the sense of infallible, immutable, universal, or ultimate laws; nor do they possess the certainty of the majority of laws governing, as we may say here more correctly, the phenomena of the physical world. They are properly classed under the head of empirical laws, inasmuch as they are reached by experience alone and afford in themselves no explanation of the phenomena in which they are exhibited; and sooner or later they may all be resolved into other laws of a simpler nature. Until they are so resolved, however, they remain laws in their own right, as I may say, and may serve as useful rules of art or practice. It is to this class of laws that the formula *similia similibus curantur*—or *curentur*, as Hahnemann more correctly framed it at first—belongs; and the long and repeated discussion of the subject in the homeopathic literature, periodical and other, makes it absolutely unwarrantable on the part of the code-framers of the "regular" school to call it an exclusive dogma, to assert that it is a theory held to explain the *modus operandi* of drugs, or that it has anything mandatory in its nature, like an ordinance, divine or human, to which men must adhere under penalty of expulsion from Paradise or societies chartered by the state.

To have mentioned the matter of empirical laws is to have come directly upon the question of science, the most fundamental of all the questions at issue between the two schools. If it were possible to reach an understanding on this point, the public, and the profession too, would be "immensely advantaged," and all the questions of secondary importance which continue to complicate and confuse the discussion would then fall away of their own accord. The old school continues to follow, in the main, as it has done for two thousand years, the rational or dogmatic method of determining the indications for the use of all its remedies, including drugs—a method which results, of necessity, in a practice essentially allopathic; a term, by the way, suggested by Hahnemann, and accepted freely and advisedly by the entire profession up to within the last eight or ten years. It is the application of common sense, trained and untrained, logical and illogical, and always biased measurably by tradition, dogmatism, and the imperfections attending all medical education, to every new discovery in the sciences auxiliary to medicine proper, and to every new theory which can be put forward with sufficient plausibility or authoritativeness. In other words, it is common sense turned loose, without guide or compass, among the most difficult of all human problems, and under circumstances the most unfavorable for its clear and judicial exercise, since it is called upon to reach conclusions in the presence of suffering and danger, as well as the consideration for daily bread. In all cases in which the cause of disease or injury is recognizable and readily removable, this method yields the most brilliant results—a fact as cheerfully recognized by the homeopaths as by their opponents. But in the great majority of all the disturbances the general practitioner is daily called upon to treat, in which the cause is remote or matter of mere conjecture, and not to be reached by direct means, common sense, and even the most thoroughly disciplined judgment and reason, are too liable to be wholly at fault, as the history of medicine even in our own day amply shows.

The new school, on the other hand, follows the empirical method in seeking to establish clear and practicable indications for the use of drugs, for which substances it claims a curative power which may or may not be independent of its

physiological action. It takes such correlated facts as accident or experiment has brought to light, and by induction infers from them a law or principle which it then converts into a rule of practice. Such facts are the countless instances of similarity between the physiological effects of drugs and the phenomena of such morbid processes as are removable by them. To collect and sift these facts, to find as nearly as possible the conditions under which they occur, and to reproduce them by experiment, is the scientific task of the new school, while its art consists in applying the knowledge thus gained in practice. In the exercise of the healing art, therefore, it is, to quote a line of Pope's, "led by a rule that guides, but not constrains"—a point never to be lost sight of; for where other more direct and speedy measures are plainly indicated, or where no curative reaction can be looked for, its application ceases.

Since this principle deals with facts for the most part unexplained and unexplainable, and since the conditions under which it must be applied are ascertainable only in a limited measure, the liability to error and failure in its use is necessarily great; and we recognize, moreover, the difficulty of determining whether a recovery has taken place as the result of the medicine administered, or independently of it. But with all its limitations and imperfections, and with all the folly, confusion, and misconception surrounding it on all sides, it is a step in the direction of reform in therapeutics which it is impossible to value too highly, or to abandon at the dictation of any code of ethics. It represents the first conscious and systematic effort in the history of medicine to apply the inductive methods to pharmako-dynamics, or drug-action—by no means the most insignificant part of therapeutics; and the more faithfully these methods are followed in the production of new facts and the elimination of error, the more speedily will an independent science of therapeutics be established, and the more certain will be the healing art. In dealing with this subject, it is always to be remembered that the "science" of an inexact or conjectural science like medicine lies much less in its theories, or even in its results, than in its methods, and that all sciences, to be worthy of the name, must be inductive at first.

Much of what you say in your article on "Guiteau and the Experts" in the same number of the *Nation* which brings the expressions of grief and reproach from you: "regular" correspondents, bears directly on the subject of the claims of those who hold themselves to be the custodians of science. I beg to recommend it to your correspondents for their calm and dispassionate re-perusal.

Obediently yours,

W. W.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 9, 1882.

Notes.

THE ninth of the "Q. P. Indexes" is the first to bear the name of the industrious and disinterested compiler, Mr. William M. Griswold, A.B. (Harvard), now assistant librarian in the Library of Congress. It is a 'General-, Autor-, und Sachregister zu Zeitschriften meist historischen Inhalts,' or subject and author index particularly to the *Historische Zeitschrift, Unsere Zeit*, and the *Historisches Taschenbuch*. The last, according to a table on the back of the title-page, dates from 1830; the other journals from 1859 and 1857 respectively. Mr. Griswold, still possessed by the reformatory spirit, introduces the American Library Association's conventional initials for Christian names (as R.=Richard,

R.—Rebecca), and dispenses with the capital initial for substantives. For the rest, the Index resembles in all respects its English predecessors in the same series. It may be had, like them, at Bangor, Maine, or abroad of K. F. Köhler, Leipzig.

We have received a little brochure of eight pages, constituting a 'Bibliography of the Bacon-Shakespeare Literature,' compiled by W. H. Wyman. Its sixty-three titles are all, save two, in Mr. Wyman's library. No. 62 is a partial bibliography contributed by the same hand to the Madison (Wis.) *State Journal* of April 24, 1882. No. 1 is rather a forerunner than a part of the controversy, being "the first known article questioning the right of Shakspeare to the authorship of the Shaksperian dramas" ('The Romance of Yachting,' New York, 1848).

An essay on the *αραξ λεγόμενα* in Shakspeare was lately read before the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, by Prof. James D. Butler. By his actual count, in Schmidt's 'Lexicon,' he found that 364 words beginning with A occurred only once, and 310 beginning with M, or nearly one-fifth of our entire stock of M's. He accordingly estimates the whole number at 5,000 and upwards. A small proportion are compounds. In nine nearly consecutive lines relating to Queen Mab ("Romeo and Juliet," I., iv.) there are nine of these once-used words, including *grasshoppers*, *film*, and *benefice*. Even *variety*, in "Nor custom stale his infinite variety," occurs nowhere else in Shakspeare's plays.

Mr. W. S. Kennedy prints, in the *Literary World* for July 15, "An Emerson Concordance: Being a Partial Index to Familiar Passages in his Poems." So much trouble calls for more—a complete Emerson vocabulary, for prose and poetry, worthy of so great a master of the English tongue.

Still another series of novels is promised—"The Kaaterskill Series," of which G. W. Harlan & Co. are to be the publishers. 'A Fair Philosopher' and 'A Modern Hagar' are the first announced, "from the pens of two leading novelists." The volumes will be cloth-bound, and have a uniform price of one dollar.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have issued, in a pretty form, with limp covers, a collection of poems on horseback-riding, called 'In the Saddle.' Almost everything is here, from Shakspeare's description of a horse, in his "Venus and Adonis," to Joaquin Miller's "Kit Carson's Ride," not omitting translations from Körner, Bürger, and Rückert. "Balder" is the only significant, as well as beautiful, poem which we happen to miss, and his ride was by no means a dash like Paul Revere's, or John Gilpin's, or that which "brought the good news from Ghent to Aix": "Nine days rode he deep and deeper down."

The Executive Committee of Iowa College, whose buildings were so sadly wrecked by the cyclone which lately fell upon Grinnell, utter an appeal for aid. This institution has been particularly unfortunate since its incorporation in 1847. It had not fully recovered from the disastrous fire of 1871. The direct loss by the storm was not less than \$75,000.

The Washington and Lee University, Virginia, conferred, at its Commencement in June, the degree of Ph.D. on the basis, for the first time, of definite study and the passing of an examination. The post-graduate course required covered two years; the subject was the English language.

Mr. Salomon Wiener's reflections upon law compose what he calls his "Monthly Mirror of Justice"; the first instalment, on capital punishment, etc., bearing date of June, 1882 (New York).

The first number of the weekly *Dominion Re-*

view is before us—one more effort to establish a national critical journal (Montreal: Wm. Drysdale & Co.). We can at least say of it that it is a serious and respectable enterprise. As regards the National Policy, it is decidedly for free trade. It has at present but two departments—political and literary. From its Table-Talk we make the following extract: "It is not generally known that Mr. Grant Allen, whose writings have attracted so much merited commendation of late, is a Canadian." Nor, we will add, could this fact be ascertained from the latest edition of 'Men of the Time,' from which Mr. Allen's name is wanting.

News to us, also, it is that the Agassiz Association, of which the central chapter is at Lenox, Mass., has now upward of 275 chapters, and a membership exceeding 3,000. It was originally started as a children's society, and its organ is still the *St. Nicholas* magazine; but "parents and teachers have taken as great interest in it as the younger ones." How to organize a chapter is told in the 'Hand-Book of the St. Nicholas Agassiz Association,' just published by Mr. Harlan H. Ballard, Principal of the Lenox Academy. It contains, besides, instructions for collecting, preserving specimens, etc.

The American Forestry Congress, presided over by Commissioner Loring, of the United States Department of Agriculture, will hold its first session at Montreal on August 21, 22, or two days before the assembling of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the same city.

The latest forestry bulletins of the Census Bureau (Nos. 15, 16) show the pine and spruce supply of Maine, and the chiefly black spruce supply of New Hampshire and Vermont. In Maine the virgin forest is now reduced to a petty area about the head waters of the St. John River, while the hemlock is confined to the eastern quarter of the State. The devastation of the white pine is the marked feature of the other map.

The *Antiquary* for July (London: Elliot Stock; New York: J. W. Bouton) has a short obituary notice of the late Col. Joseph Lemuel Chester, regretful and laudatory, like those in other English journals. It makes, however, the mistake of saying that Colonel Chester, "upwards of twenty years ago, sat as a member of Congress." No person of that name, we believe, ever did so.

The *Athenæum* is about to print a series of hitherto unpublished Byron papers, including an extensive correspondence, which "will be found to demonstrate the baselessness of the various statements made by Lady Byron in her later years to her sister-in-law's discredit."

B. Westermann & Co. send us the first number of *Gallia*, a monthly periodical, edited by Dr. Adolf Kressner, at Cassel. Its aim is, neglecting all Romance idioms but old and new French, to pass in review all departments of current French literature. The form is octavo, pp. 36; the type Roman and large-face. The contents of periodicals, learned and literary, are noted and commented on, and there is a list of new publications.

—The English Executive Committee of the Darwin Memorial (the form of which has not yet been decided, but will probably include an endowment for a scholarship to carry on biological research) have invited the aid of an American committee. The following eminent scholars and scientists have consented to serve in that capacity: Asa Gray, Chairman; Spencer F. Baird, James D. Dana, Charles W. Eliot, D. C. Gilman, James Hall, Joseph Le Conte, Joseph Leidy, O. C. Marsh, S. Weir Mitchell, Simon Newcomb, Charles Eliot Norton, Francis A.

Walker, Theodore D. Woolsey, and Alexander Agassiz, Treasurer. Subscriptions may be sent to Mr. Agassiz at Cambridge, Mass., and will be duly acknowledged and forwarded. We cannot doubt that a large number of Americans will be found eager to take part in the world's tribute to the greatest discoverer of the age.

—The "Midsummer Holiday Number" of the *Century* is unquestionably the best of the magazines for August. It contains another instalment of Mrs. Burnett's "Through One Administration," a novel which promises to be fascinating to the heart of woman, for whom, after all, are not most women's novels written? As a picture of society we may have something to say of this tale when it appears in its completed form, but it is not as a picture of society that any young lady interested in that wonderful mystery which the relations of the sexes presents to her mind, is reading it now. The central figure is a woman who has married the wrong man, and is in love with the right one, and miserable because she is in love with him. He is a good man, but not good enough to go away and stay away; and hence complications of the most terrible and soul-wrenching character are threatened. There is another man who is also in love with, or at any rate deeply interested in, Bertha, and who seems to have a good deal of influence over her, and who begins in the current number of the story to be almost as *de trop* as the husband. He of course knows nothing of the tragedy which is taking place in his wife's heart, and is evidently going to come to grief of some kind before long. Then there is the father of Bertha, who watches his daughter's career with a kindly paternal affection, but seems hardly competent to do more than watch. Altogether it is a story to interest greatly any alert foreign observer of American manners, like M. d'Haussonville, for instance, very much, though what he would make out of it is another thing. There are several illustrated articles—the "Borderlands of Surrey," by Alice Maud Fenn; the "American Museum of Natural History," by J. B. Holder; "An Aboriginal Pilgrimage," by Sylvester Baxter; "Some English Artists and their Studios," by Cosmo Monkhouse; and "Steam Yachting in America," by S. G. W. Benjamin, being the most important. Mr. Robert Grant, the author of "The Confessions of a Frivolous Girl," contributes a burlesque called "The Lambs, a Tragedy," which tells the sad story of the shearing of Phipps, a Wall Street lamb, through the alternate fall and rise of the stocks which he buys and sells as "flyers." The plot is hardly varied or novel enough to be amusing, but some of the verses show a good deal of burlesque imitative power. The Chorus of Bulls, descriptive of the two great economic laws which govern Wall Street, chants with a real classic feeling:

"There is a law, as grim and grave as death,
Which now we know, but then we did not know,
That whosoever buys, though boasted cheap
As dirt from ditches, the accursed thing
For which he hath not in his private purse
The power to pay, shall surely come to grief.
And he who sells, although the market soar
High as the kite which kisses the chaste sky,
The baleful property he does not own,
With hopes to cover his defenceless "shorts,"
Before the advent of the setting day,
Shall surely lick the dust; and this is fate."

—John R. G. Hassard contributes an interesting article on "How Wagner Makes Operas" (the frontispiece of the magazine is a portrait of the composer), which gives as good an account of his theories of musical and dramatic composition and of the true relation between the arts as we have seen anywhere. It is the article of an enthusiast rather than a critic, who seems incapable of perceiving the weak side of his master. Wagner's early determination to "write poetry

like Shakespeare's and marry it to music like Beethoven's" would hardly strike us as more than the expression of the aspiration of an ambitious boy, if there were not in his whole career something which suggests that the prophecy sprang from a less amiable quality than ambition. Mr. Hassard points out that the great rule of lyric composition which he has made the fundamental principle of opera, and with which he may be fairly said to have laid the theory of Italian opera in ruins, is that of correspondence between the poem and the melody. It is, as Mr. Hassard points out, often a matter of opinion whether a given musical phrase fits a given verse or not; but there are practices of the Italian composers which are hardly open to discussion. The conventional rules of Italian opera (which are admirably burlesqued, by the way, in "Pinafore") were a musical growth solely, the parts of the whole bearing a simply musical relation to each other, and the dramatic part being entirely subordinated to them. It was owing to this that Wagner's early efforts at reform met with such violent opposition. It was felt that he was not a reformer so much as a destroyer, and that what he wished to introduce was not opera at all, as hitherto understood, but a new thing, which must in the end drive out the old altogether.

—*Lippincott's Magazine* has a readable article on "Shires and Shire Towns in the South," by Anthony Van Wyck, which recalls the fact that with all its barbarism and slavery there was a great deal of truth in the old Southern idea of there being something English about the Southern planters and their lives. They were not much like modern Englishmen, but they had retained a great many English habits of thought and ways of life as they existed at the time of the Revolution, when every American gentleman made it a point to be as English as he could in his house and way of life and thought. After the Revolution the South remained stationary, while England and the rest of the world moved on and underwent all sorts of social modifications; but the Southern planter and country gentleman kept alive a good many English country traditions a hundred years later than they lasted in England. It was the same with literature. The Southerner's ideas of literature down to the time of the Rebellion were still those of the contemporaries of Addison and Goldsmith; the Southern political style copied that of England a hundred years ago, and the limits of advanced thought were marked by an admiration for Byron. They preserved, as Mr. Van Wyck points out, the old ceremonious manners of the last century long after they had disappeared elsewhere. A few of the old half-English shire towns are still left—each one a little capital, and local centre of society and forum for the administration of county justice—languid and empty in midsummer, but a scene of great activity at certain times in the year, when the entire surrounding population comes into the town. Mr. Van Wyck declares that were you "privileged to enter one of the grand old places" on the outskirts of the town—

"you would often find here groups of polished gentlemen and ladies, with a courtly grace, slightly tinged with the old ceremonious manner, exchanging the commonplaces of ordinary conversation with a social ease and vivacity unsurpassed by any English-speaking people. The gentlemen have made the European tour in their early years; have seen Washington at its best; have heard Clay and Webster, Calhoun, Marshall, and Prentiss; have ridden the circuit themselves perhaps, and crossed swords with Berrien, or Stephens, or Toombs, in their prime, or with the Heywards, Pettigrew, or Legaré. The ladies have been educated at Macon, or at Columbia, or at Northern schools; have passed summers

without number at Saratoga or Cape May; have flirted at Washington with many of the magnates of their generation. Without any pretensions to learning or the slightest tinge of *bluesness*, they are always delicate, refined, often elegant, and have a grace and piquancy of their own which, joined to their acknowledged domestic virtues, have justly won for them an exalted place among American women."

But surely this is rather a reminiscence of the dear departed past than a picture of anything that it is very easy to meet with at this moment.

—The *Atlantic* publishes with its August number a supplement containing a full and particular account of the Birthday Garden Party to Mrs. Stowe, with a list of the guests, and the addresses and poems. This is in part interesting and in part "valuable for purposes of preservation," which is more than can be said of everything that is published in the magazines of the month. We can hardly imagine any one, for instance, desiring to preserve the current instalment of Mr. Hardy's "Two on a Tower" very long. Mr. Hardy seems to be struggling along without any definite idea as to what he means to do, and trusting to the fact that a serial story must be continued from month to month to bring him out all right at the end. "Studies in the South" contains nothing very new; the picture of the South presented by Mr. Harrison has been anticipated to a great extent in the newspapers. Northern Democrats, who, as a class, need all the instruction they can get from any quarter, would do well to look at what he has to say in this number about the Southern view of "subsidies" and centralization. The Democratic sages who are in the habit of trying to foster a belief in the party that the South will help them when the time comes for a strict construction of the Constitution and a limitation of the powers of the central Government, are undoubtedly making a profound miscalculation. The Southerner does not understand, since he has been made to suffer from "centralization" in the war, why he should not have all the benefits that centralization can give in time of peace. Centralization then, to his mind, meant loss of property and life, and the general ruin of the country. Centralization now seems to mean subsidies for any one who wants them; a general use of the treasury to fill private pockets, his own included, and thus make good the damage inflicted upon him by his adhesion to the lost cause. "Across Africa," by Charles Dudley Warner, is a pleasant bit of description of a kind at which Mr. Warner is an adept. Mr. Bishop's "House of a Merchant Prince" begins to hold out promise of revelations of financial irregularities on the part of one of the most respected and trusted of his characters. Mr. W. T. Harris contributes an article on Emerson, which contains some interesting bits of criticism, though written in a somewhat metaphysical vein. Dr. Holmes and "H. H." have two poems, and there is an article called a "Study in Sociology," by M. A. Hardaker, which shows that the writer is studying sociology very hard indeed.

—*Harper's* for August offers, amid much that is readable, little that calls for remark. The scenic beauties of Wisconsin, and particularly of the river which bears the name of the State, are authentically illustrated with pen and pencil in Mr. John A. Butler's paper entitled "Some Western Resorts." Mr. Higginson begins his new popular history with "The First Americans," and discusses Morgan's pueblo theory with the aid of graphic representations. He objects that the artistic achievements of the Central Americans, particularly in sculpture, make the identification of their "palaces" with communal houses incredible, and imply a degree of development more in accordance with Span-

ish traditions than with a restoration based on the study of the pueblo dwellers of to-day. He cannot accept "the assumption that all the delicate beauty and all the artistic skill of the Yucatan edifices were lavished upon communal houses, built only to be densely packed with Indians 'in the Middle States of Barbarism,' as Morgan calls them." The question, however, should not be approached with assumptions on either side. No one can any longer doubt the validity of the clues furnished by the Iroquois social system and Long House, or that the communal system has been surely traced from the Great Lakes to beyond the Rio Grande. The search for missing links is still going on upon this line. Meantime all our knowledge of savage races, past and existing, proves that attainment in art invariably outstrips social progress, and that equality in it does not imply identical social or political institutions. We pointed out the other day the parallelism between the textile products of the Alaskans and the ancient Peruvians; but who would undertake to infer from this a common form of government or a common architecture? For more light, by the way, on the aboriginal art of the Pacific Coast, one may read in the current *Harper's* Mr. Dawson's account of the Haidas of the Queen Charlotte Islands.

—News reached this country on Monday of the death, at Vallombrosa, of Mr. George Perkins Marsh, for more than twenty years United States Minister to Italy, and one of the foremost American scholars and authors. Mr. Marsh was born with the century, and in March last entered upon his eighty-second year. He was a native of Vermont, a State which has always known how to bring its best men to the front and keep them there. He graduated from Dartmouth in 1820, and speedily gained a leading position at the bar. Obeying the tendency to drift from law into politics, he was first chosen to the councils of the State, and afterwards to Congress, where he served for seven years, and until, in 1849, President Taylor offered him the Turkish mission. Three years later he was charged with a special mission to Greece. The years 1854-60 were spent in his native country, and then, as one of the first acts of Mr. Lincoln's administration, in March, 1861, he was appointed to the post from which no succeeding administration ever had the face, if it had the thought, to remove him. In time he became the dean of the diplomatic corps in Italy. Mr. Marsh's earliest as well as latest studies were in the domain of philology. In 1838 he printed a 'Compendious Grammar of the Old Northern or Icelandic Language,' compiled and translated from Rask. In 1859 appeared his 'Lectures on the English Language,' and in 1862 his 'Origin and History of the English Language,' both of which went through many editions. But his mind had also a singular aptitude for practical science, and was ready, at the bidding of the Vermont Legislature in 1847, to make a report on the artificial propagation of fish, or to prepare for the Smithsonian Institution in 1854 an essay full of delightful learning on the camel, with reference to its introduction in the United States. How wide had been his observation and his notes was first realized when, in 1864, he brought out the fascinating study originally called 'Man and Nature,' but afterwards more exactly described, in a revised and enlarged edition, as 'The Earth as Modified by Human Action.' This work, which must always give pleasure to the reader, was translated into Italian under the author's supervision, with fresh amendments. Mr. Marsh's style was remarkably perspicuous, and his writings stand almost alone among those of his countrymen in their combination of literary grace with ex-

trepreneurial intellectual versatility. His strength of fibre is shown by the age at which he produced what might be thought his most enduring monument, 'Man and Nature.' For years after that, however, he wrote freely for the press. To the first volume of the *Nation* (July-December, 1865) he contributed a striking series of articles, entitled "Were the States Ever Sovereign?" and to the third and fourth volumes some admirable "Notes on the New Edition of Webster's Dictionary." A few other titles which belong to this period will show the wide range of his interest: "Pruning Forest-Trees," "Agriculture in Italy," "Old English Literature," "The 'Catholic Party' of Cesare Cantù and American Slavery," "The Excommunication of Noxious Animals by the Catholic Church," "Female Education in Italy," "The Education of Women," "Protection to Naturalized Citizens," "Mont Cenis Tunnel," "Physical Science in Italy," "Proposed Revision of the Bible." At the age of seventy-five he reviewed for these columns at great length Colonel Yule's 'Marco Polo'; at seventy-six, Boccardo's 'Dizionario Universale di Economia Politica e di Commercio'; at eighty, he contributed (*Nation*, No. 815) a charming "Biography of a Word." A month later came the review (his last), in the form of a letter, of Lanciani's great work on the "Aqueeducts of Ancient Rome." Mr. Marsh's mental vigor and youthful enthusiasm remained with him, as these articles show, absolutely unimpaired to the end of his venerable career.

—The Index Society has issued its third Index of Obituaries. The first, for 1878, had only 6,000 names, the second had 12,000, and the third, for 1880, must have nearly 16,000. The increase this year is partly due to the collaboration of American librarians, who have worked for this very much as they worked for Poole's Index. For 1881 there will be even greater additions from American sources. Now that we have shown that the thing can be done, it is to be very much wished that France and Germany could be persuaded to join forces. Such an annual index is one of the necessities of civilization. But this yearly list alone is not enough. Its use in the future would be greatly facilitated by a decennial index of the Index, referring in the briefest form (Abney, 80) to the years in which the full reference is given. By the use of small type, four columns to a page, the family name alone being used except when there are two of the same name, an index for ten years could be compressed into a volume no thicker than the one before us, of one hundred small quarto pages.

—In a late session of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* M. Miller read a translation of several hitherto unpublished fragments of *Ælian* which he had discovered in a manuscript. They were in a double sense *anecdota Græca*. One or two may be worth quoting. A certain queen of Cyprus, Demanassa, whom no other author has mentioned, made three laws: that adulterous women were to have their hair cut, and be delivered to prostitution; that men guilty of suicide were to be deprived of burial; and that he who killed another's ox should himself be slain. Now Demanassa had a daughter and two sons. The daughter committed adultery, one of the sons committed suicide, and the other killed his neighbor's ox. The laws were strictly executed in all three cases. Some one blamed Euripides for going to market himself when Sophocles left that task to his slave. "Yes," said Euripides, "Sophocles eats what his slave prefers, and I eat what I like myself." Diogenes, seeing a woman swept away by a torrent, cried out, "There goes an evil carried away by an evil evilly."

—The literary recollections of M. Maxime Du Camp, which have already been noticed in these columns, are still running their course in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. He devotes a chapter to Beaudelaire, one of Mr. Swinburne's sad-mad-bad-glad brothers. When Charles Beaudelaire was fourteen years old, his mother, a widow, married Colonel Aupick, of the French army, a martinet whose ideas concerning the education of youth were as ill-adapted as possible to curb the rebellious spirit of his stepson. The result was a series of quarrels, culminating in a pitched battle, on the occasion of a grand official dinner given by Colonel Aupick in his capacity of chief of staff at Lyons. Beaudelaire was packed off to India, where he took contracts to furnish the British troops with cattle, and made a living as best he could, being aided by his mother with occasional surreptitious remittances. Being but seventeen years of age, he acquired a thorough knowledge of English. He lived also some time at the Cape. When he returned to France he was of age, and entered on the enjoyment of his patrimony. While it lasted, which was not long, he led a life of conspicuous elegance. His mother made an effort to introduce him into the best society, but his contempt for the social amenities soon closed all doors against him. He felt more at home in cafés and wine cellars, where a generation of the great men of the future listened as he recited his unpublished verses, and rewarded him with unstinted applause. In this way he acquired a sort of small reputation in the editorial rooms of the minor journals, even before he had printed anything. Although he never fulfilled the high expectations which were entertained in some quarters, he occupies an important place in the second rank of the poets of his time. M. Du Camp gives an amusing account of the way in which he made the acquaintance of Beaudelaire:

"He called on me at a small country house at Neuilly, which I had taken for the summer of 1852. His dress and general appearance were eccentric, and although evidently possessed of much muscular strength, he had a wasted and jaded look. The beginning of our conversation was odd. He said, 'I am thirsty.' I offered him beer, tea, grog. He answered, 'I thank you, but I only drink wine.' I asked whether he preferred Bordeaux or Burgundy. 'If you allow me, I will take both.' A bottle of each was brought, a glass, and a decanter of water. He said, 'Please have that decanter taken away: the sight of water is disagreeable to me.' During the hour that our interview lasted, he emptied the two bottles, swallowing a tumbler-full at a time. As I noticed that after each potation he watched furtively, to see what impression his conduct was producing, I remained quite impassive, laughing in my sleeve. His originality, although great, was often put to a great strain by the efforts he made to display it. One Sunday he came to my house with his hair dyed green. I pretended not to notice it. He stood before the glass, looked at himself, passed his fingers through his hair, and generally made a desperate attempt to attract attention. Not succeeding, he asked me: 'Don't you think there is something strange in my appearance?' 'Why, no.' 'But my hair is green: surely that's uncommon.' I replied, 'Everybody's hair is more or less green; now, if yours were sky-blue, I might be surprised, but green hair you will find under every hat in Paris.' Almost immediately after he went away, and, on his way out, meeting one of my friends, he said, 'I would advise you not to call on Du Camp to-day: he is in a horribly bad humor.'"

—Notwithstanding his peculiarities and his shiftless mode of life, Beaudelaire was undoubtedly possessed of considerable talent. As a poet, his range was limited; but within his limit his strength was great. As a prose-writer, his translations from Poe were a masterpiece. He had an innate sympathy with the American writer, whom he first made known in France, and with whom he had completely identified himself. Without being aware of it, he had one great defect, which, for a writer, was a fatal one—he

was ignorant. What he knew he knew well, but it was little. History, physiology, archæology, philosophy, escaped him; in fact, he never cultivated them. He had been through the colonies, Southern Africa, the Indies, and brought back nothing. He seemed to have travelled with his eyes shut. He was a subjective poet, and the external world interested him but little. He may have seen it, but he certainly never studied it. Whatever attention he devoted to it was solely for the purpose of discovering the vices which should justify him in his contempt for the human race. When his "Les Fleurs du Mal" appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for June, 1855, they created a sensation and achieved a success. The success was only heightened when his poems appeared in a volume and the Government committed the blunder of proceeding against them as an offence against the public morals. There was nothing in them that warranted such a charge, and, as always happens in such cases, and always will happen, the book attained a popularity which was perhaps not greater than its merits deserved, but undoubtedly greater than it could otherwise have reached in so short a time. Notwithstanding this piece of luck, fortune did not smile upon him. Ultimately he fell into a paralysis of the faculties, and ended his days in a mad-house.

—M. Babelon has published an interesting memoir in which he traces the commerce of the Arabians much further north than it had hitherto been supposed to go. The Arabs appear to have started from the Caspian and followed the course of the Volga to the Baltic Provinces, and then to have spread around the Baltic over the shores of Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and some distance up the rivers. The evidence consists in the Arabic coins found in all these places. Of course this is not proof positive that the Arabian merchants themselves had penetrated so far, any more than the great quantity of Canadian silver that circulated here during and after the Civil War is a proof that we were overrun by Canadians; but it is certain that the Arabians had a very considerable commerce in early times with these hyperborean regions, whether they penetrated to the North Sea themselves or not. We say "early times," because no coins are found later than 1040, indicating that the commerce had ceased not long after that date.

—Eight years ago the sixth edition of the 'Geographisch-statistisches Lexikon,' called "Ritter's" by way of trade-mark, appeared, and now we have the first instalment (A-Anne) of the seventh (Leipzig: Otto Wigand; New York: B. Westermann & Co.). A new editor has been employed, Dr. Heinrich Lagai; the size of the page has been enlarged in both dimensions; and we may readily take the publishers' word for it that a significant increase will be made in the number of titles. In fact, the sixty-four pages before us stop at a title which is found on the 52d page of the previous (smaller) edition, while every effort has been made to keep down the bulk by omissions and contractions. The abbreviations have been multiplied to a degree which makes consultation much less easy for a foreigner. A very slight examination shows that the articles have been extensively revised and rewritten, and that the censuses of 1880 have been availed of. Egypt, Afghanistan, Algeria, and America have noticeably received more attention; Africa has perhaps been slightly condensed. The aim of this gazetteer is essentially to satisfy commercial needs, and its conspicuous merit, apart from other needful qualities, is fulness. Long use of it has satisfied us of its superiority in this respect to any work of the kind we have ever met with. Its principle of

inclusion is, for Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, all places having 100 inhabitants and upward, and baths, factory towns, postal and railroad stations with even fewer. For the rest of Europe, the minimum population is 200 to 500, and for the world at large, 500 to 1,000. This 'Lexikon' must be thought indispensable in every counting-room where German is used or understood; nor should any library be without it.

SEWALL'S DIARY.—I.

Diary of Samuel Sewall, 1674-1729. Vol. III. 1714-1729. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Vol. vii. Fifth Series. [See *Nation*, Nos. 686, 697, 765, 766.]

THIS, the final volume of the Sewall 'Diary,' containing also an index of the names in the present volume, and what is supposed to be a general index of all the volumes, completes the publication. In several respects the close of the work is disappointing, but in no respect is it so disappointing as in the important matter of the general index just referred to. Judge Sewall's 'Diary' is essentially a work of historical reference. It can never be a popular book, or even in considerable demand with general readers. There is too much uninteresting detail in it; nor is the subject in any aspect a large or inviting one. To the student of New England history, however, it is a mine of necessary information. The 'Diary' brings him directly face to face with the inmost life of the people whose story it is his object to narrate. He cannot, however, even after repeated readings, carry its whole contents in his head, nor can he spend hours rummaging its pages in search of something of which he retains a vague recollection that he has seen it there or somewhere else. To works dealing with the original material of history a thorough index is essential. Without it, half their value is lost. They are merely full of buried treasures.

In this respect the publications of the Massachusetts Historical Society have heretofore been remarkably strong. Their indices have been models of thoroughness. For some reason, which is not apparent, the past reputation of the Society in this respect has not been sustained in the present case. The Sewall index is certainly large enough, for it fills 140 double-column pages; but it is confined to proper names, with simple page-references, unaccompanied by any indication of subject-matter. For instance, under the perfectly meaningless title of "The Governor"—a title of no conceivable use to any investigator—there are 544 page-numbers in close succession without one word of explanation. Under that of Cotton Mather there are some 300; under that of Joseph Dudley, some 200; as many under New England; while under Boston there are no less than 476. An investigator, therefore, looking to see if there is anything in Sewall on a particular point connected with the history of Boston must worry through 476 citations before he can satisfy himself whether it is there or not. Hunting for a needle in a hay-stack is nothing to this. Such work, we submit, is not indexing; it is an exasperating sham. The purpose of an index is to lay open easily to investigators the whole contents of a book. Merely to pile up columns of page citations does not lay open the whole contents of any book, and is little better than a pure waste both of the time of the compiler and the money of his employer. In this case it is to be hoped that a proper and intelligent index will be found in the final volume of the series of the Historical Society's Collections, of which the 'Diary' will be a part. If it is not found there, the value of this work to

the historical student will be very seriously impaired.

Turning to the third volume in itself, it will be found to cover the period from May, 1714, to October, 1729, or from the sixty-second year of the writer's life to a few months before its close, on January 1, 1730. In public affairs this period was almost identical with the reign of George I., and during it Col. Samuel Shute was Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Politically, it was far from an interesting or instructive time: it was the day of small things and of slow growth. The colony was just finishing the first century of its existence, and the struggles of infancy were not yet over. The Indian wars had been, it is true, forced back from the Narragansett country and the Connecticut to the wilds of New Hampshire and Maine, but they still continued, and drained the community of its youth and its substance. Indeed, the most dramatic and memorable incident of this whole period was that expedition of 200 men to Norridgewock on the Kennebec, in August, 1624, which resulted in the death of Father Rasle—an event, by the way, no mention of which is found in the 'Diary.' The entire population of the Province was then about 95,000, and that of all New England 160,000; while Boston was a thriving commercial town of some 18,000 inhabitants. Outside of Boston the people were very poor, exacting from the sterile soil a bare living, and nothing more. They wore homespun, used the farming utensils which for centuries had served the needs of Englishmen, ate Indian-corn bread, molasses and salt meat, drank rum and cider, worked early and late in their fields, and attended meeting and town-meeting, and hung about the village taverns.

On the sea-coast, about 150 boats, in which sailed some 600 men, were engaged in fishing; and the Province owned about 190 sail, which were navigated by some 1,100 seamen. The foreign trade of Boston, Salem and Newburyport, in which places all the little wealth the colony had then amassed was concentrated, was carried on with the mother-country, the other Provinces and the West India Islands, and consisted of the exportation of products of the forest and cattle, and the importation of sugar, molasses and rum.

It was a dreary, monotonous, commonplace period—a period without literature, art or science. Cotton Mather was the leading divine of the day, and the 'Magnalia' its choicest product. Sewall was now thoroughly a part of his time and surroundings. His natural taste for music and poetry and finer things had been ground out of him by lifelong contact with the hard, material, superstitious world in which he had his being, and his 'Diary' reveals an honest, frivolous, bigoted, but kindly and affectionate old man, fading gradually away. In fact, it is open to very great doubt whether this portion of the 'Diary' ever ought to have been published at all—whether indeed, the publishing it, at any rate in full, is not a grievous breach of good taste. It is mainly the domestic record of an old man with whom the dangerous practice of journal-writing had become a settled habit, and who wrote down in his 'Diary' for what end it is impossible to say, whatever for any day was uppermost in his mind; and domestic and private matters are at nearly all times uppermost in most men's minds. Unfortunately, Sewall's first wife, to whom he had been married forty-three years, and who had borne him fourteen children, died in 1717. He was then Chief-Justice of Massachusetts, and sixty-five years of age. Twice, however, after that did the old man marry again, once at the age of sixty-seven, and again at seventy; and it is with the details of these marriages and the events which preceded

them that the pages of this volume are full. It is, we submit, a record with which neither the public nor the historian has anything to do. The minute details of the courtships of an old man may be very entertaining, but they are not of public moment, nor are they characteristic of the life or the manners of any particular period. They are pure gossip, and gossip of a not very creditable kind. Of such gossip this volume is full.

For instance, the following is highly amusing, but in what way does it concern posterity? It certainly is not history. One feels as if he were a sort of Peeping Tom even in reading such a record in the time-worn manuscript. Hannah, the Chief-Justice's first wife, had died on the 19th of October, 1717. On the 29th of October, two years later, in the presence of a numerous progeny, the old man of sixty-seven is married again, his own son being the officiating clergyman. The bride was Madam Abigail Tilley, born Melyen, who had been twice married before. The marriage took place at Mrs. Tilley's house, between seven and eight o'clock of the evening of Thanksgiving Day, "in the best room below stairs." The following is the venerable bridegroom's account of his wedding-night, now first printed in full:

"Mrs. Armitage introduced me into my Bride's Chamber after she was a-bed. I thank'd her that she had left her room in that Chamber to make way for me, and pray'd God to provide for her a better Lodging: So none saw us after I went to bed. Quickly after our being a-bed my Bride grew so very bad she was fain to sit up in her bed; I rose to get her Petit Coats about her. I was exceedingly amaz'd, fearing lest she should have dy'd. Through the favor of God she recover'd in some considerable time of her fit of the Tisick, spitting, partly blood. She herself was under great Consternation."

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM.

The Future of Islam. By Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1882.

IT is somewhat difficult to criticise an author who launches forth on the sea of political prophecy and political speculation so fearlessly as Mr. Blunt. In the compass of a brief book of little more than two hundred pages he confidently predicts a new and higher moral and intellectual life for the followers of the Prophet; he reconstructs the map of the Mohammedan world, and assures the British people that the only safe and reasonable policy for them to adopt, if they desire to preserve their Empire in its integrity, is to constitute themselves the guardians of Islam against all its assailants. Mr. Blunt is not so explicit as he ought to have been in stating his claims to be listened to when he asks us to accept upon his authority the probability of such a vast revolution as this. He does not even say if he is acquainted with Eastern languages, or has devoted much of his time and thought to the study of Moslem history; and perhaps, in the absence of any such assurance, we are justified in assuming that he is unacquainted with Eastern languages, and has no special or profound knowledge of Moslem history. At any rate, the only reason which he gives in the book before us why we should accept him as a veritable prophet is that he "visited Jiddah in the early part of the past winter, and that he subsequently spent some months in Egypt and Syria in the almost exclusive society of Mussulmans." This, assuredly, is a very precarious foundation for such a vast superstructure of political prophecy as that which he has thought fit to build upon it; and we think it will not be difficult to show that his vaticinations will not survive the application of reasonable criticism.

Mr. Blunt, then, is of opinion that not merely will the Ottoman Empire cease to exist at no distant period, but that the Moslem portion of its population will, upon its disappearance, be converted to Christianity. He believes that the Moslems in the Khanates of Central Asia are not unlikely to follow this example—that all Northern Africa as far as the ranges of the Atlas will be Europeanized; that Persia will separate itself from the faith of Islam; and that from the remaining portions of the Mohammedan world, but chiefly from among the Arabs, will begin a reformation of Islam that will bring the crude and elementary morality of the Koran into harmony with the moral and intellectual ideas of the nineteenth century. It is this fancy, that the Arabs will impart a higher moral and intellectual life to Islam, which appears to us the most extravagant thing in Mr. Blunt's little book, and convinces us that he has paid very slight attention to the past history of Mohammedanism. He appears to have taken for granted the popular, but altogether erroneous belief, that the civilization of Bagdad and Cordova was due to the Arabs, whereas, in point of fact, it existed in the face of their bitter opposition. The Arabs have always fought against any enlargement of the narrow boundaries of the creed of Islam, have always protested against any attempt to liberalize its doctrines as rank heresy, and they remain in consequence, to this day, in precisely the same condition, socially, morally, and intellectually, as when the Prophet appeared among them.

"It is," writes Ibn-Khaldun, the most philosophical of Moslem historians, "a very remarkable fact that nearly all the learned men who have distinguished themselves among the Moslems by their aptitude in the sciences, whether religious or intellectual, were foreigners. The examples to the contrary are extremely rare; for even those among them who were of Arabian extraction differed from that people in the language which they spoke, the country where they were brought up, and the masters under whom they studied. . . . All the great divines who have dealt with the fundamental principles of the law, all those who have distinguished themselves in dogmatic theology, and the greater part of those who devoted themselves to Koranic exegesis, were Persians—a fact which demonstrates the truth of the saying attributed to the Prophet: 'If, said he, 'science were suspended from the height of heaven, there are among the Persians those who would possess themselves of it.'"

Bagdad and Cordova owed their transient period of intellectual brilliancy, the former to Persian and Syrian Christians, the latter to Jews and Christians. The Arabs, as Ibn-Khaldun points out in his invaluable 'Prolegomena,' have never done aught but bring ruin and desolation upon every country which they entered. The only purely Arabic movement which has risen up in Islam since the death of the Prophet was the Wahhabee revival, and this, Mr. Blunt himself admits, "took no account whatever of the progress of modern thought," but expected "by force of arms to Arabianize the world again." We are therefore at a loss to conjecture by what process Mr. Blunt has arrived at the conclusion that the Arabs are about to belie the whole tenor of their preceding history, and apply themselves to such a gigantic and, to our thinking, impossible task as the production of an edition of Islam with all the latest religious improvements of the nineteenth century incorporated therein.

Still less is it comprehensible by us how an Islam remodelled after this fashion is to be made acceptable to Malays, Negroes, Kaffirs, Chinese, and others, all of whom, according to Mr. Blunt, only await the proclamation of the new religion to embrace it with fervor and alacrity. Mr. Blunt has apparently been persuaded into be-

lieving that a spiritual reformation is at hand because thinking men among the Faithful are deeply dissatisfied with the present condition of the Mohammedan world, with the infidels encroaching upon all its borders. But there is no necessary connection between this dissatisfaction and a reconstruction of the theological and other beliefs which dominate the Mohammedan world. One thing is certain: no religion can rise to a higher level of spiritual life than that of its own fountain-head; and unless it can be shown that the present state of the Mohammedan world is due to a falling away from the primitive creed of Islam, it is idle to anticipate a religious revival infusing life and vigor in its decaying members. Now this, we maintain, it is impossible to show. Whatever other faults may be ascribed to the followers of the Prophet, that of religious inconstancy cannot be numbered among them. Intellectually and morally, they have presented an impregnable opposition to the advances of Western thought, and clung, through good report and ill report, to their Prophet and the legal systems which have been deduced from the Koran. Although not explicitly clothed with divinity, the Prophet holds, in the faith of the Moslem, a position very similar to that of Christ in Christianity. Every sound, orthodox Moslem believes that in every act and saying of his life Mohammed was under a divine guidance which has made of him a pattern and example for all generations to come. Slavery, polygamy, concubinage, divorce, religious war, intolerance—all the practices, in short, which have wrought the greatest havoc in the Mohammedan world—are not merely sanctioned, but commanded, by the example of the Prophet. It is impossible for any Moslem to call them into question without at the same time calling into question the sanctity and wisdom of Mohammed—without, in other words, cutting himself off from the company of the Faithful. Mr. Blunt's expectation of a spiritual reformation of Islam is all the more remarkable because he does not anticipate that the pilgrimage to Mecca and the honors paid to the black stone will hereafter be performed with less fervor and depth of conviction; but if the Moslems ever arrive at the conviction that the Prophet was wrong in all that he taught and practised regarding slavery, polygamy, concubinage, and religious war, it is tolerably certain that they must arrive at the same conclusion regarding the silly and unmeaning ceremonial of the Mecca pilgrimage.

Mr. Blunt's last chapter is devoted to "England's Interest in Islam," and in this he gravely propounds a policy for Great Britain which it is difficult to read without laughter. "On the downfall," he says, "of the Ottoman Empire, whenever that event shall occur, the rôle of England in regard to Islam seems plainly marked out. The Caliphate—no longer an empire, but still an independent sovereignty—must be taken under British protection and publicly guaranteed its political existence, undisturbed by further aggression from Europe." To afford this protection with the smallest cost and trouble to itself, Mr. Blunt is of opinion that Great Britain ought to see that the Caliphate of the future be set up in Mecca, and when this has been effected the same much-enduring Great Britain ought, according to Mr. Blunt, to make of the pilgrimage a sort of Cook's tour, "personally conducted" by itself. "A systematic development of the pilgrimage as a Government undertaking, with the construction of a railway from Jiddah to Mecca and the establishment of thoroughly well-ordered lines of steamers from the principal Mohammedan ports—all matters which would amply repay their cost—would every year add a new prestige to English in-

fluence." Mr. Blunt has omitted, probably by accident, from this admirable programme the erection of a number of monster hotels in and around Mecca, with a staff of "thoroughly well-ordered" waiters from London for the accommodation of the pilgrims.

"The mission," Mr. Blunt goes on to say, "is a high one, and well worthy of her acceptance. . . . Nor will her refusal, if she refuse, be without grave and immediate danger. The Mohammedan world is roused, as it has never been in its history, to a sense of its political and moral dangers, and is looking round on all sides for a leader, of whatsoever name or nation, to espouse its cause. We can hardly doubt that the position of directing so vast a force, if abandoned by England, will be claimed by some more resolute neighbor. . . . The Caliphate is a weapon forged for any hand—for Russia's at Bagdad, for France's at Damascus, or for Holland's (call it one day Germany's) in our stead at Mecca. Protected by any of these nations, the Caliphate might make our position intolerable in India, filling up for us the measure of Mussulman bitterness, of which we already are having a foretaste in the Pan-Islamic intrigues at Constantinople."

After reading this, few will doubt that Mr. Blunt has been indulging to excess in a practice commemorated by Coleridge under the title of "Fancy in Nubibus":

"Oh! it is pleasant with a heart at ease,
Just after sunset or by moonlight skies,
To make the shifting clouds be what you please,
Or let the easily-persuaded eyes
Own each quaint likeness issuing from the mould
Of a friend's fancy."

The European nations, England included, have quite enough on their hands for many years to come without giving up their time and labor to such a work of supererogation as the protectorate of the Mohammedan Caliphate. Mr. Blunt's language leaves it somewhat doubtful whether he expects that Great Britain should take up this onerous duty at once, or defer it until the Ottoman Empire has vanished into the inane and the Arabs have spiritually regenerated Islam. The grammatical construction of his sentences points to the present as the time for entering upon these new duties, but the general tenor of his reasoning would require that it should be postponed until the Arabs have renovated Islam. It is quite certain that at present Great Britain could not construct railways and build hotels on the Sacred Territory for the convenience of the Faithful; and as the Arabian reformation will certainly synchronize with the Greek Kalends, Mr. Gladstone's Government need not be alarmed by the menacing predictions of Mr. Blunt if they do not carry out his policy.

RECENT NOVELS.

Marion Fay: A Novel. By Anthony Trollope. Harper's Franklin Square Library.

Two Old Cats. By Virginia W. Johnson. Harper's Franklin Square Library.

Guerndale. An Old Story. By J. S., of Dale. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

MR. TROLLOPE has in 'Marion Fay' written a very long story, and used for it materials that hardly have the recommendation of novelty. There is a Marquis of Kingsbury, who has much trouble with his family, and especially with his second wife; there is his son, Lord Hampstead, who falls hopelessly in love with Marion Fay, a poor Quaker girl; and his daughter, Lady Frances, who engages herself to a post-office clerk, Mr. George Roden. The poor Quaker girl dies, leaving Lord Hampstead inconsolable, while George Roden turns out to be an Italian nobleman, and Lady Frances makes him happy. Then there is a family chaplain who arouses the reader's interest at one time by thinking over a little plan for murdering Lord Hampstead. Actual murder, however, is not at all in Mr.

Trollope's line, and the chaplain's criminal designs do not take the form of overt acts. There is some low comedy introduced through the medium of the adventures of a vulgar young woman named Clara Demijohn and a pair of rivals for her hand. There is a great deal of love, but very little incident; and love-scenes without incident to relieve them are apt to be mawkish. Flatness has always been at once Mr. Trollope's forte and foible, and in 'Marion Fay' the flatness occasionally approaches the point of burlesque. With a man in love tender associations will undoubtedly cluster around any object, however unromantic, that the loved one has touched. But when we have sympathized with Lord Hampstead's interest in a poker because Marion Fay has had it in her hand, we feel that we have done all that should be required of us. Too much poker, even when hallowed by love, palls upon us, and we resent the introduction of it as a serious part of the sentimental machinery of a novel.

Socially, the story has some interest as a picture of the effect of modern ideas with regard to love and marriage on an aristocracy which, like that of England, is already hopelessly hemmed in by the rising democratic tide. There is every worldly reason why Lady Frances should not be allowed to engage herself to George Roden; but no one can prevent it, and the reader feels that it was rather a tribute to aristocratic prejudice and romantic tradition to turn him into an Italian duke at the end. The story would have been much less commonplace had he remained a post-office clerk and married Lady Frances in the face of the whole British peerage. He does, it is true, refuse to take his title, and, consequently, has to keep his mother's name, which is a senseless proceeding, as it is a name assumed by her under the impression that her marriage was invalid. The best-drawn character in the book is that of Mr. Sam Crocker, whose vulgar vanity, self-assertion, curiosity, good humor, and untruthfulness make up altogether quite a perfect modern cad.

'Two Old Cats' is but a trifle of a story, and yet it is not trivial. As heretofore in Miss Johnson's work, the love-story and the lovers themselves are but secondary. We quite know beforehand the handsome and ingenuous pair who, after not too much adversity, happily walk off the stage hand in hand at the end of the play. The charm of the story is its setting—the shores of the Mediterranean. The cats are neither very old nor very bad—the one with paws of velvet, soft and beguiling; the other stern, repellent, always ready for scratches, but both equally selfish and self-seeking (for the conversion of the hero's maiden-aunt is altogether too sudden to be very virtuous). So good material as Miss Johnson's deserves greater pains in putting together, and something more of care is needful to her, or small slips and inadvertencies will grow to serious faults.

A large part of 'Guerndale' is occupied with a description of college life at Harvard about ten or twelve years ago. The rest of the book is an ordinary novel, which, though showing a considerable amount of cleverness, would, without this introduction, not be likely to attract a great deal of attention. It is rather a man's book, and will therefore probably be read by all the women and children who can get hold of it. These should be warned, however, not to put too implicit confidence in the picture given of Harvard. No one not a recent graduate can speak with entire authority on this subject; but it is safe to say that the youthful cynic Randolph and the excessively good Guyon Guerndale are both overdrawn. The author, who is evidently young, has put all that he knows of life into the book, and, being young, his knowledge of life is

naturally derived to a great extent rather from books than from observation.

Pictures of college life are almost always disappointing, because they reveal, if they are at all true, an appalling amount of folly and weakness in their heroes, who have lost the freshness of boyhood without acquiring the wisdom of maturity. A college man in the United States is either a hard-working young fellow who aims at qualifying himself for some profession—in which case his career as a student presents few points of interest—or else he is some rich man's son, placed beyond the necessity of work, and who comes to college because it is the most gentlemanly thing to do, or because his father did it before him, or because he does not know what to do with himself. This class is small in all American colleges, but probably is larger at Harvard than elsewhere, and always makes more noise than any other, because it has more time on its hands. It develops in each class, with great regularity, a "fast" set, who ape the vices of men, and make themselves ridiculous in doing so. It is this set which is described in 'Guerndale.' All the hardened young reprobates who compose it are accustomed to drink and smoke a great deal, swear like pirates, gamble, and idle away their time in a very silly way. They consider themselves men, and pass for men among their friends, and talk about their life as a very fine and delightful one. But there is obviously nothing about it that lends itself especially well to fiction. Profanity may be attractive to a boy, just as drinking brandy and water or smoking strong cigars may be, merely because in his innocence he associates swearing and drinking and smoking with the idea of adult maturity and freedom. But the chronicling of his oaths and his debauches is a dreary task, and the tale is one which must, when it is told, make rather a painful record. The author of 'Guerndale' has contrived to make it more entertaining than we should have thought possible by the introduction of Norton Randolph, the cynic to whom we have referred—an amiable pessimist and misanthrope, deeply versed in the latest speculations of the day, always on his guard against excitement or enthusiasm, an agnostic of the agnostics, with the constitution of an Ajax, the wit of a Voltaire, and the profundity of the Stagirite himself. At heart he is a lover of his kind, and stealthily does good in many unexpected ways. His conversation reeks with hopelessness. New England, he declares, "will shortly be the most immoral country we know. And the sinister fact about it is, that its unhappiness and immorality will be found not in the highest classes or the lowest, but in the great middle class, on which the social life and future of a nation depends. We are accustomed to shrink with horror from French novels and French morals: to-day the bourgeoisie of France is purer and happier than our own." Again: "Religion has degenerated into a curious social custom. I look at a New England meeting-house in much the same outside way that I should look at a Chinese joss-house—it serves as a sort of social nucleus to a parish where they periodically run into debt and cut down the preacher's salary." Finally, he proposes, "as the only way of impressing the necessity of social, moral, and physical strength on the people, that all criminal, infirm, and insane persons be etherized." These are the perfect flowers of youthful cynicism. To be a cynic of this sort it is necessary to be twenty years old, in perfect health, and completely happy. There may be such cynics at Harvard even now, but they are in real life not so clever as Mr. Norton Randolph, whom the author has to a great extent made his own mouthpiece.

John C. Calhoun. By Dr. H. von Holst. [American Statesmen.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1882. Pp. 356.

IF the series of 'American Statesmen' is in its general character historical rather than biographical—aiming, that is, to present the man in his relation to the national life, rather than to portray him as an individual member of society—this is especially to be expected of Calhoun. The life of John Quincy Adams is one of the most dramatic in history; that of Hamilton is full of incident; but of Calhoun as a man, his biographer says, "but very little is to be told. Even his contemporaries, with perhaps the exception of his nearest neighbors, did not know much of his doings as a private individual. . . . We hear that he was a just and kind master to his slaves, that he was possessed of an uncommon conversational talent, and that he exercised an especial fascination upon young men. That is about all" (p. 4). "Yet it is unquestionably true," he goes on (p. 7), "that the name of Calhoun already conveys a much more definite idea to the American people than that of either Webster or Clay," because "Calhoun is in an infinitely higher degree the representative of an idea, and this idea is the pivotal point on which the history of the United States has turned from 1819 to nearly the end of the first century of their existence as an independent republic. From about 1830 to the day of his death, Calhoun may be called the very impersonation of the slavery question."

The volume before us, therefore, appropriately entrusted to the distinguished historian of this epoch, may be described as a history of the slavery question, with especial relation to Calhoun's participation in it. In view of the vital nature of this controversy, and the lack of biographic elements in Calhoun's career, the plan of the book is all that could be desired. It would seem, however, that the personality of its subject is at times unduly left out of sight. The book has become so completely a history of the slavery question—and one, too, treated almost exclusively from the most profound and analytic point of view—that the reader is often left in the dark as to dates and persons. The chapter entitled "Slavery," an admirable sketch of the early history of the controversy, is often defective in this regard; and the chapter which follows, "Under Van Buren," really carries the narrative down into Tyler's administration. We read (p. 172): "Calhoun now took this decisive step," etc. What the decisive step was we are thoroughly informed; but when was "now" the reader is left to guess, for there is not a date within seven pages.

Dr. von Holst has another fault, the common fault of allusiveness. The great majority of his readers will be young men whose memory does not carry them beyond the war of the rebellion, and to whom many of these once so familiar names and incidents are either wholly unknown or call up the most shadowy image. We read, for example (p. 226): "The bursting of the cannon 'Peacemaker' on board the *Princeton*, on February 28, 1844, ended the embarrassment of the Secretary." We venture to say that not half who read this passage will understand that this desired relief came to the Secretary in question (Mr. Upshur) by removing him to another world. In many cases, as in this, the account would be materially improved by a foot-note or a slightly different wording in the text.

These faults—if we may call them such—are much less prominent in the closing chapters on "Texas" and "Oregon and the Mexican War." Mr. Calhoun's relation to these three important questions is portrayed with great perspicuity and a remarkable degree of individuality. As Secretary of State in the Texas negotiations, he is shown (p. 233) to have been guilty of direct

falsehood in asserting, in his letter to Mr. Pakenham, that the annexation project was forced upon the United States by the policy of Great Britain. And his attitude toward Mexico and Great Britain in Polk's Administration, honorable and patriotic as a whole, was seriously affected by his fanaticism on the subject of slavery. The "greatest and most fatal political blunder of his whole career" is declared (p. 276) to have been his refusal to move in opposition to the President's Mexican policy, for fear of lessening his influence in the Oregon matter. But Polk had already "made up his mind to satisfy England with regard to Oregon. Calhoun could have crossed the way of the President in the most determined manner, without risking anything except his standing as an 'Administration man,' and that he was sure to lose at any rate."

If Calhoun's career was not a dramatic one, like that of John Quincy Adams, it was in its close tragical in the highest degree. He saw clearly the approach of the "irrepressible conflict" which he had done more than any other man to precipitate; and yet the inevitable result—disunion—was one which he never desired, from which he shrank. "He lived long enough not to derive any consolation from the vain hope that [his] last attempt to save the Union by rendering slavery absolutely safe in the Union would be successful" (p. 328). His life may be pronounced incomplete, because he did not live to see the direct and necessary consequences of his own labors; and for the same reason the reader lays down the book with a sense of incompleteness—it is a history rather than a biography, and as a history it needs to be supplemented by a survey of the eleven stormy years which brought us at last to that necessary outcome of his theories which he saw plainly enough, but refused to believe inevitable.

The most important lesson to be drawn from the life of this great man is the danger in following pure logic as a guide in statesmanship. History is not made by logic, but by compromise; and although, as Dr. von Holst remarks, "compromise between antagonistic principles is *ab initio* an impossibility," yet without compromise no government can be conducted. Now, Calhoun's life was spent in bringing the nation into an attitude in which no compromise was possible, because it was *principles*, and not measures of expediency, that were opposed to each other.

"The founders of the republic had been under the necessity of admitting slavery into the Constitution, and the inevitable consequence was that conclusions which were diametrically opposed to each other could be logically deduced from it by starting the argument first from the fact that slavery was an acknowledged and protected institution, which, so far as the States were concerned, was out of the pale of the Federal jurisdiction; and then from the no less incontestable fact that the determining principle of the Constitution was liberty, and that the spirit and the whole life of the American people fully accorded with the Constitution in this respect" (p. 127).

This remark goes to the bottom of this tremendous conflict. The antagonism between the letter and the spirit of the Constitution

was one which a really wise statesman, not governed by a pitiless logic, would have avoided by suffering the requirements of the letter to be tacitly dropped out of sight. There is no question that, on the question of fugitive slaves for example, the North neglected its constitutional duty; and no more question that this constitutional duty was one which a free community could never be forced to perform. Probably nothing but war could ever have determined a contest so vital and of such magnitude; but its vitality and magnitude were largely the work of Calhoun. "The speculations of the keenest political logician the United States ever had, ended in the greatest logical monstrosity imaginable, because his reasoning started from a *contradictio in adjecto*" (p. 351).

It is interesting to observe (p. 200) Calhoun's relation to the reform in the civil service, which, even forty-five years ago, was becoming an important question. The bill which proposed to dismiss from the service officers who sought to influence elections was opposed by him as unconstitutional, and for the further reason that the abuse would be transferred from the office-holders to "the no less formidable corps of the office-seekers." The remedy proposed by him was to "place the office-holders, with their yearly salaries, beyond the reach of the executive power"; to which Dr. von Holst remarks: "If he had changed but one word—if he had said *party in power* instead of *executive power*—this advice would, indeed, have been the egg of Columbus."

In one point we cannot quite understand Dr. von Holst's interpretation of the Constitution. In speaking (p. 190) of Calhoun's resolutions of December 27, 1837, in which it is declared that "every State 'entered into the Union' by its own voluntary act," he remarks: "The old Union, under the Articles of Confederation, therefore, evidently had ceased to exist some time before; when and how, Calhoun unfortunately forgot to say." But this does not follow. There is no question that the States had entered this old Union by their own voluntary acts, and Calhoun's argument does not require this Union to have been dissolved previous to the formation of the new one; but, the sovereignty of each State being explicitly reserved under the Articles of Confederation, he argues that it was not surrendered under the Constitution.

The Army of the Cumberland. By Gen. H. M. Cist. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1882.

THIS work, so far as we can follow it, seems to be a conscientious and truthful narrative of the operations of the Army of the Cumberland from the date of its organization to the end of the Chattanooga campaign, but it does not deal with the battle of Shiloh, in which that army took such an important part. The plan of the series of histories to which it belongs very properly assigned that battle to the history of another campaign; for, while the events connected with it were of great interest and importance, the movement which led to it was divergent from the line of operations marked out for the Army of the Cumberland. The narrative before us gives a minute account of the various minor incidents,

scouts, and skirmishes in Kentucky and Tennessee, as well as of the operations of greater importance; but owing to the poor maps and plans (reduced from Van Horne's exhaustive work) which accompany the text, it is almost impossible for the reader to get a proper idea of the theatre of war, or the significance of the marches and combinations under consideration. Certainly no one but an officer of intelligence who had served in that army could follow its movements as described, or get at any satisfactory understanding of their object.

The volume now under consideration is, however, subject to another, and even graver, objection than the one just pointed out. Failing in value to the student of military history, we should naturally expect it to possess such other qualities as would commend it to the approval of the general public; but such is not the case. It is neither brilliant in style, nor graphic in its descriptions of marches and battles. The personal qualities of the generals arrayed against each other are quite neglected. The names of Charles G. Harker and William Graham Jones, graduates of West Point, and officers of extraordinary brilliancy and promise, are hardly mentioned. Gordon Granger, whose timely arrival on the battle-field of Chickamauga (whither he had marched to the sound of the enemy's guns) brought Thomas that support which enabled him to hold his position to the close of that disastrous day, was a swaggering but bold, competent, and successful soldier, whose picturesqueness at least might have been turned to account. It is perhaps unknown to many that Sheridan, who afterward reached such high rank as commander of cavalry in the Army of the Potomac, commanded a division of infantry in the Army of the Cumberland, and had his fair share of misfortune and disaster. Through it all he showed the qualities which afterward raised him to the rank of Lieutenant-General; yet, if the reader depended upon these pages for his information, he could not even tell whether Sheridan was a regular or volunteer, a graduate of the Military Academy, or promoted from the ranks of the army. Thomas J. Wood, a rugged veteran of excellent qualities, and varied fortunes, always at his post, sometimes successful and sometimes unsuccessful, but at all times and under all circumstances a brave, constant, and accomplished division and corps commander, likewise fails of recognition in these pages. It is true, he is censured for withdrawing from his place in line of battle at Chickamauga, in obedience to an order which it is contended that he misconstrued to the great peril of the army, but nothing is said of the long and faithful services by which he afterward atoned for his mistake, if mistake it was. Examples like these might readily be multiplied. Brief touches, a descriptive phrase like the "leading motives" with which Carlyle introduces the sea-green incorruptible or the rebellious needleman, a well-placed adjective, are all that we have a right to exact in narratives so condensed as these of the Scribner series. But even these are wanting in the uninspired performance before us.

HENRY HOLT & Co.'s

NEW

Descriptive Catalogue

Will be sent free to any one applying for it.

HENRY HOLT & CO.,
20 West Twenty-third Street, New York.

ELIANE.

A Novel. From the French of Mme. AUGUSTUS CRAVEN.

"Eliane" is interesting, not only because it is such a record of the best kind of French life and manners as could only have been written by a person thoroughly at home in the subject, but also because of the delicate drawing of character which it contains. The book is quiet in tone, and may fail to please readers who care for nothing but incident; but there are, it may be hoped,

still many readers to whom its grace and fine style will recommend it.—*London Saturday Review*, June 3, 1882.

1 vol., paper, 50 cents; cloth, 90 cents.

WILLIAM S. GOTTSBERGER, Publisher,
No. 11 Murray Street, New York.

A General Index to the Nation,

From July, 1865, to September, 1880.

Net price (no trade discount), \$2.50. Purchasers will please remit with order. Address Publisher of the Nation, Box 794, New York, or Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine.

